Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at San Francisco State University

Professional Services Division

April 18, 2007

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at San Francisco State University. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation is made for the institution.

Accreditation Recommendations

1. The Team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for San Francisco State University and all of its credential programs: **ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS.**

Following are the stipulations:

- That the unit provide evidence that leadership supports a clear vision for educator preparation and fosters cohesive management, including clear communication and articulation, lines of authority and responsibility both within and across the unit.

- That the unit provide evidence of the implementation of a comprehensive program evaluation system involving program participants, graduates, and local practitioners. The system must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous program improvement and must be applied to all credential program areas.

- That the unit provide evidence that every program has a systematic fieldwork sequence that meets the program standards and that district and university field supervisors are carefully selected, trained, oriented, and assessed.

- That the unit provide evidence that all program standards less than fully met are now met.

- That the unit provide evidence that each program within the unit receives sufficient resources in relation to the student population it is required to serve. The resources must enable each program to effectively operate in terms of coordination, recruitment, advisement, program development and instruction.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

Adapted Physical Education Specialist Credential

Administrative Services
    Preliminary
    Preliminary Internship
    Professional

Clinical Rehabilitative Services
    Language, Speech and Hearing
    Audiology
    Orientation and Mobility

Education Specialist
    <u>Preliminary Level I</u>
        Mild/Moderate Disabilities
        Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship
        Moderate/Severe Disabilities
        Moderate/Severe Disabilities Internship
        Deaf and Hard of Hearing
        Early Childhood Special Education
        Physical and Health Impairments
        Visual Impairments

    <u>Professional Level II</u>
        Mild/Moderate Disabilities
        Moderate/Severe Disabilities
        Deaf and Hard of Hearing
        Early Childhood Special Education
        Physical and Health Impairments
        Visual Impairments

Multiple SubjectMultiple Subject
    Multiple Subject Internship
    BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish and Cantonese)

Pupil Personnel Services
    School Counseling
    School Counseling Internship

Pupil Personnel Services
    School Psychology
    School Psychology Internship
    School Social Work

Reading and Language Arts Specialist
Reading Certificate
Reading and Language Arts Specialist

Single Subject
Single Subject
Single Subject Internship

(2)   Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- All stipulations must be met by June 30, 2008
- San Francisco State University not be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation until stipulations have been removed.
- San Francisco State University be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2013-2014 academic year subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation visits by both the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Background Information

San Francisco State University (SFSU) is one of 23 campuses in the California State University system. SFSU is located on 106 acres in urban San Francisco, one mile from the Pacific Ocean and 15 minutes from downtown San Francisco. The university community is ethnically and culturally diverse, coming from across the nation and almost 110 countries around the world. There is no "majority" group, with about 70% of undergraduates who are people of color, as are 40 percent of our graduate students. SFSU recently ranked 11th in the nation as a producer of ethnic minority university graduates, second nationally in awarding master's degrees in English to minority students, number one nationally in undergraduate business degrees awarded to Asians, and among the top 10 in a guide to "Top Colleges and Universities for Hispanics." The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), the University is "an energetic, dynamic university involved in revitalizing its urban mission. It is an engaged university with strong commitments to community outreach and collaborations. It is an ethnically and racially diverse university where composition of its students, faculty and staff mirrors that of its surrounding geographical areas."

The University was founded in 1899 as San Francisco State Normal School, a two-year teacher training college, and it was the first normal school in the nation to require a high school diploma for admission. In 1921 the institution was renamed San Francisco State Teacher's College. In 1935 the name changed to San Francisco State College to reflect an institutional shift in focus to liberal arts. SFSU attained university status in 1972 and was renamed San Francisco State University in 1974. The current institutional mission is to create and maintain an environment for learning that promotes respect for and appreciation of scholarship, freedom, human diversity, and the cultural mosaic of the City of San Francisco and the Bay Area; to promote excellence in instruction and intellectual accomplishment; and to provide broadly accessible higher education

for residents of the region and state, as well as the nation and world. Robert Corrigan is the current University President.

SFSU degree-conferring programs include 118 bachelor's and 96 master's degrees; two joint doctorates in education (with the University of California, Berkeley), one independent doctorate in education; and two joint doctorates in physical therapy and a joint master's degree in physical therapy (all with the University of California, San Francisco). Degrees are offered through eight colleges: Behavioral and Social Sciences, Business, Creative Arts, Education, Ethnic Studies, Health and Human Services, Humanities, and Science and Engineering. As of fall 2006, the University had 1,807 faculty members, comprised of 884 full-time, permanent faculty and 923 lecturers. In fall 2006, the University's total enrollment was 29,628 students, made up of 23,843 undergraduates and 5,785 graduate and professional students. SFSU produces about 7,500 graduates a year.

B.   The unit

There are five departments within the unit—Administration and Interdisciplinary Studies, Elementary Education, Instructional Technology, Secondary Education, and Special Education— that provide program opportunities for candidates to develop skills as reflective school professionals and leaders. In California, higher education institutions are not permitted to offer education majors at the undergraduate level. The unit offers a minor in education, approved by the SFSU Academic Senate in May 1998. At the initial level, the unit offers a multiple subject (elementary) credential program, a single subject (grades 6-12) credential program, an education specialist credential (Level I).

At the advanced level, the unit offers the following specialist credential programs: reading and language arts specialist, adapted physical education specialist, designated subjects credential for adult education or vocational education. In addition, the unit offers the following services credential programs: administrative services, pupil personnel services, and clinical rehabilitation services (Speech, Language, Hearing; Speech, Language, Hearing with Special Class Authorization; Audiology; and Orientation and Mobility for Visually Impaired). A master in arts in education is offered with concentrations in adult education, early childhood education, educational administration, equity and social justice, elementary education, instructional technologies, language and literacy education, mathematics education, secondary education, and special interest. The unit offers a master of arts degree in special education (Levels I and II) and a master of science degree in communicative disorders. A joint doctoral program in Special Education is offered in conjunction with the University of California-Berkeley and leads to a Ph.D. or Ed.D. degree. A joint doctoral program in Educational Leadership has also been offered for four years in conjunction with University of California-Berkeley, CSU East Bay, and San José State University, and leads to the Ed.D. degree. This program is being discontinued as SFSU shifts its emphasis to a new Ed.D. doctoral degree program in Educational Leadership, which began in fall 2007. See Table 1 (SFSU Institutional Report, pp.14-15, with correction) for all program specifications and state approval status.

In fall 2006, 1,601 candidates were enrolled in credential and graduate degree programs — approximately half in credential-only programs and half in graduate degree programs. The number of credential candidates graduated and recommended for credentialing in the 2005-06

academic year to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing totaled 1,087. Of those recommended for credentialing 427 were Multiple Subject and 334 were Single Subject credential candidates. The unit conferred 326 graduate degrees in professional education disciplines in the 2005-06 academic year. Table 1 lists student enrollment by initial and advanced level program.

There are 64 full-time, tenured and tenure-track faculty (47 are tenured; 17 are probationary) at the assistant, associate, or full professor rank. All faculty have terminal doctoral degrees in education or related disciplines, and all are engaged in teaching, research, and service. Many faculty also received external funding for programs. In addition, the unit has 136 adjunct faculty lecturers, most of whom are part-time, all with advanced degrees, and many with doctorates. Doctoral candidates and graduates from the master's programs contribute to the lecturer pool.

Table 1
Program Review Status

Program Name	Award Level (e.g., Bachelor's or Master's)	Program Level (ITP or ADV)*	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs	Program Report Submitted for Review (Yes/No)	State Approval Status (e.g., approved or provisional)
Initial Preparation						
Multiple Subject	Credential	ITP	220	CCTC	YES	Approved
Single Subject	Credential	ITP	219	CCTC	YES	Approved
Special Ed	CR MA	ITP ADV	190	CCTC	YES	Approved
Adult Education Vocational Ed	Credential MA	ITP ADV	33	CCTC	YES	Approved
Advanced Credential Programs						
Adapted PE	Credential	ADV	6	CCTC	YES	Approved
Reading Specialist Language/Literacy	Credential MA	ADV	34	CCTC	YES	Approved
PPS						
School Counseling	Cr/MA	ADV	69	CCTC CACREP	YES	Approved
School Social Work	Cr/MA	ADV	6	CCTC	YES	Approved
School Psychology	Credential/ MS	ADV	17	CCTC	YES	Approved
Specialist						
Reading Specialist Language/Literacy	Credential MA	ADV	34	CCTC	YES	Approved
Adapted PE	Credential/MA	ADV	6	CCTC	YES	Approved
Special Education Level 2	CR MA	ADV	190	CCTC	YES	Approved
Services						
Educational Administration	Credential/ MA	ADV	57	CCTC	YES	Approved

School Counseling	Credential/ MA	ADV	69	CCTC CACREP	YES	Approved
School Social Work	Credential/ MA	ADV	6	CCTC	YES	Approved
School Psychology	Credential/ MS	ADV	17	CCTC	YES	Approved
Communicative Disorders	Credential/ MS	ADV	87	CCTC ASHA	YES	Approved
Other Advanced Degree Programs						
Adult Education	MA	ADV	33			
Early Childhood	MA	ADV	69			
Elementary Education	MA	ADV	31			
Mathematics Education	MA	ADV	13			
Secondary Education	MA	ADV	25			
Equity and Social Justice	MA	ADV	60			
Special Interest	MA	ADV	55			
Educational Technology	MA	ADV	1			
Instructional Technology	MA	ADV	97			
Ed. Ldrshp. Joint Doctorate	Ed.D.	ADV	38			
Special Ed. Joint Doctorate	Ph.D.	ADV	17			
Ed. Ldrshp. Ed.D.	Ed.D.	ADV	Begins Fall 07			

*ITP = Initial Teacher Preparation; ADV = Advanced Preparation

Programs offered in the Colleges of Behavioral and Social Science and Health and Human Services have the responsibility to prepare candidates to serve as reflective practitioners and leaders in their capacities as support personnel and specialists in educational settings.

The unit collaborates with community schools, clinics, and agencies to provide diverse clinical experiences. Projects include Muir Alternative Teacher Education (MATE) Program, Jefferson Elementary School District Program, Jefferson Union High School District Program, San Francisco Unified School District, and private schools such as the San Francisco Archdiocese and Lick Wilmerding School.

Some programs are delivered offsite or via distance technology. The internship programs with Elk Grove Unified School District are offered at the district's schools. Mobility for Visually Impaired courses are offered using distance learning. The Instructional Technology program will be offering hybrid online courses in fall 2007.

Since the last visit, new California legislation was enacted that requires standards-based assessments of candidate learning. In addition, changes in selected state program requirements have occurred. The SFSU Strategic Plan was developed with campus wide participation and implemented in 2004. The unit's state program review was delayed due to a one-year state

postponement and one-year moratorium on implementation of program changes. In the unit, a number of programs have conducted searches for new faculty as a result of retirements, program growth and attrition. The position of Associate Dean for Academic Affairs has been vacant since summer 2006. A new doctoral program in Educational Leadership was developed and will begin taking cohorts in fall 2007.

Merged COA and NCATE Visit

This was a continuing accreditation visit by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The visit merged the accreditation processes of the Committee on Accreditation (COA) and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) according to the approved protocol. The Accreditation Team, which included membership from the COA and NCATE, received a single Institutional Self-Study Report, worked from a common interview schedule, and collaborated on all decisions related to accreditation standards.

The merged visit was based upon the partnership agreement reached between the COA and NCATE. The first partnership agreement was developed and signed in 1989. The Partnership was revised and renewed in 1996 and subsequently revised and renewed in 2001. The Partnership Agreement requires that all California universities who are NCATE accredited participate in reviews that are merged with the State's accreditation process. The agreement allows the university the option to respond to the NCATE 2000 Standards, provided that the Commission's Common Standards are addressed in the context of that response. It also allows the subsequent accreditation team report to be written based upon those standards. San Francisco State University exercised that option. In addition, the institution must respond to all appropriate Program Standards. The agreement also states that the teams will be merged, will share common information and interview schedules, and will collect data and reach conclusions about the quality of the programs in a collaborative manner. However, the accreditation team will take the common data collected by the team and adapt it according to the needs of the respective accrediting bodies. This is because the NCATE Unit Accreditation Board requires a report that uses the familiar language and format of the NCATE standards rather than the language that is needed for the COA (i.e., information about Common Standards and Program Standards.) Under the provisions of the partnership agreement, California universities are not required to submit Folios to the NCATE-affiliated professional associations for review. The state review stands in place of that requirement.

Preparation for the Accreditation Visit

The Commission staff consultant, Teri Clark, was assigned to the institution in Fall 2005, and met with institutional leadership in Spring 2006. The meeting led to decisions about team size, team configuration, standards to be used, format for the institutional self-study report, interview schedule, logistical and organizational arrangements. In addition, telephone, e-mail and regular mail communication was maintained between the staff consultant and institutional representatives. The Team Leader (Co-chair for the visit), Dr. Joel Colbert, was selected in Fall 2006. The Chair of the NCATE Board of Examiners (Co-chair for the visit), Dr. Brigette Valesey, was assigned in Fall 2006. On February 6, 2007, the NCATE co-chair and the staff consultant met with the representatives of San Francisco State University to make final determinations about the interview schedule, the template for the visit and any remaining organizational details.

Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report

The Institutional Self-Study Report was prepared beginning with responses to the NCATE unit standards and appropriate references to the California Common Standards. This was followed by separate responses to the Program Standards. For each program area, the institution decided which of the five options in the *Accreditation Framework* would be used for responses to the Program Standards. Institutional personnel decided to respond using Option One, California Program Standards.

Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team

Decisions about the structure and size of the team were made cooperatively between the Dean and Faculty of the School of Education and the Commission Consultant. It was agreed that there would be a team of twenty-three consisting of the NCATE Co-chair, the California Co-chair, a Common Standards Cluster that would include five NCATE members and two COA members; a Basic Credential Cluster of ten members; and a Services Credential Cluster of five members. The Dean and Consultant assigned each credential program to one of the program clusters. The Commission Consultant then selected the team members to participate in the review. Team members were selected because of their expertise, experience and adaptability, and training in the use of the *Accreditation Framework* and experience in merged accreditation visits.

The COA Team Leader and the Chair of the NCATE Board of Examiners served as Co-Chairs of the visit. Each member of the COA/NCATE Common Standards Cluster examined primarily the University's responses to the NCATE Standards/Common Standards but also considered the Program Standards for each credential area. Members of the Basic and Services Clusters primarily evaluated the institution's responses to the Program Standards for their respective areas but also considered unit issues.

Intensive Evaluation of Program Data

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the appropriate institutional reports and information from Commission staff on how to prepare for the visit. The on-site phase of the review began on Saturday, April 14. On Saturday mid-day, the Team Leader and the COA members of the Common Standards Cluster and CCTC staff began their deliberations with the NCATE team members. It included orientation to the accreditation procedures and organizational arrangements for both the COA and NCATE team members. The Common Standards Cluster began its examination of documents on the campus the rest of Saturday and on Sunday morning. The remainder of the team arrived on Sunday mid-day, April 15, with a meeting of the team followed by organizational meetings of the clusters. The institution sponsored a poster session and reception on Sunday afternoon to provide an orientation to the institution. This was followed by further meetings of the clusters to prepare for the activities of the next day.

On Monday and Tuesday, April 14 and 15, the team collected data from interviews and reviewed institutional documents according to procedures outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook.* The institution arranged to transport members of the team to various local school sites used for collaborative activities. There was extensive consultation among the members of all clusters, and much sharing of information. Lunch on Monday and Tuesday was spent sharing data that had been gathered from interviews and document review. The entire team met on Monday evening to discuss progress the first day and share information about findings. On Tuesday morning, the team Co-chairs met with institutional leadership for a mid-visit status report. This provided an opportunity to identify areas in which the team had concerns and for which additional information was being sought. Tuesday evening and Wednesday morning were set aside for additional team meetings and the writing of the team report. During those work sessions, cluster members shared and checked their data with members of other clusters and particularly with the Common Standards Cluster, since the NCATE/Common Standards findings also affected each of the Program Clusters.

Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

Pursuant to the *Accreditation Framework,* and the *Accreditation Handbook*, the team prepared a report using a narrative format. For each of the NCATE/Common Standards, the team made a decision of "Standard Met" or "Standard Not Met." The team had the option of deciding that some of the standards were "Met with Concerns". The team then wrote specific narrative comments about each standard providing a finding or rationale for its decision and then noted particular Strengths beyond the narrative supporting the findings on the standards and Concerns beyond the narrative supporting the findings on the standard.

For each separate program area, the team prepared a narrative report about the program standards pointing out any standards that were not met or not fully met and included explanatory information about findings related to the program standards. The team noted particular Strengths beyond the narrative supporting the findings on the standards and Concerns not rising to the level of finding a standard less than fully met.

The team included some "Professional Comments" at the end of the report for consideration by the institution. These comments are to be considered as consultative advice from the team members, but are not binding of the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.

Accreditation Decisions by the Team

The entire team met on Tuesday evening to review the findings and make decisions about the results of the visit. The team discussed each NCATE/Common Standard and decided that the five of the six NCATE standards were met, with ten areas for improvement identified for purposes of the NCATE report, and one Standard, Standard 2, is not met. For purposes of the COA report, that all elements of the CTC Common Standards were addressed and met within the context of the NCATE report. Four of the six NCATE Unit Standards were met with concerns for the California report and the other two standards, Diversity and Faculty, were met. , All program standards were met for eleven of the unit's programs. But nine of the unit's programs had standards met with concerns or not met.

The team then made its accreditation recommendation based on its findings and the policies set forth in the *Accreditation Handbook.* The options were: "Accreditation," "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations," "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations," "Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations," or "Denial of Accreditation." After thorough discussion, the entire team voted to recommend the status of **"Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations."** The recommendation for "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations" was based on the unanimous agreement of the team and that the overall evidence clearly supported the recommendation. Following the decision, the team went on to complete the written accreditation report, which was reviewed by the team on Wednesday morning. A draft of the report was presented to the faculty late Wednesday morning.

CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION
ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT

INSTITUTION: **San Francisco State University**

DATES OF VISIT: **April 14-18, 2007**

ACCREDITATION TEAM
RECOMMENDATION: **Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations**

RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION:
The accreditation team conducted a thorough review of the Institutional Report, the program documents for each approved credential program, and the supporting evidence. In addition, interviews were conducted with candidates in various stages of the programs, program completers who have been in the field for at least one year, faculty, staff and administration of the university, employers of graduates, field supervisors and advisory committee members. Team members obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making judgements about the educator preparation programs offered by the institution.

The recommendations pertaining to the accreditation status of San Francisco State University and all of its credential programs was determined based on the following:

> NCATE's SIX STANDARDS AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: The university elected to use the NCATE format and to write to NCATE's unit standards to meet the COA Common Standards requirement. There was extensive cross-referencing to the COA Common Standards. Also, the corresponding part of this team report utilize the NCATE standards and format. The total team (NCATE and COA members) reviewed each element of the six NCATE Standards, added appropriate areas of the Common Standards, and voted as to whether the standard was met, not met, or met with areas of improvement or concern.

> PROGRAM STANDARDS: Team clusters for (1) Basic credential programs (Multiple and Single Subject – including internship, Multiple Subject BCLAD Emphasis, Adapted Physical Education Specialist, Reading Certificate and Reading/Language Arts Specialist, Education Specialist in Special Education – Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe – including internship; Visually Impaired, Physical and other Health Impairments, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, and Early Childhood Special Education (2) Services credential programs (Administrative Services including Preliminary, Preliminary Internship, Clinical and Rehabilitative Services, and Professional and Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling including Internship) reviewed all program areas. Discussion of findings and appropriate input by individual team members and by the total merged team membership was provided to each of the clusters. Following these discussions of each

program reviewed the total team, NCATE and COA considered whether the program standards were either 'met,' 'met with concerns,' or 'not met.'

ACCREDITATION RECOMMENDATION: The decision to recommend Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations was based on team consensus that the five of the six NCATE Standards were met, with ten identified areas for improvement for purposes of the NCATE report and that two of the six standards (Standard 4: Diversity and Standard 5: Faculty) were met for purposes of the COA report with the other four standards met with concerns. All California specific elements of the CTC Common Standards were addressed and met within the context of the NCATE report, and that all Program Standards were met for eleven of the unit's programs (Designated Subjects: Adult Education, Adapted Physical Education, Education Specialist: Visual Impairments, Education Specialist: Physical and Health Impairments, Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education, Clinical and Rehabilitation Services: Language Speech and Hearing, Special Class Authorization (Aphasia), Orientation and Mobility, Pupil Personnel Services: Counseling, Psychology, and School Social Work. Nine of the programs had Program Standards met with concerns or not met (Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Reading, Designated Subjects: Vocational Education, Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate, Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe, Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing, and Administrative Services.

Following are the stipulations:

- That the unit provide evidence that leadership supports a clear vision for educator preparation and fosters cohesive management, including clear communication and articulation, lines of authority and responsibility both within and across the unit.

- That the unit provide evidence of the implementation of a comprehensive program evaluation system involving program participants, graduates, and local practitioners. The system must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous program improvement and must be applied to all credential program areas.

- That the unit provide evidence that every program has a systematic fieldwork sequence that meets the program standards and that district and university field supervisors are carefully selected, trained, oriented, and assessed.

- That the unit provide evidence that all program standards less than fully met are now met.

- That the unit provide evidence that each program within the unit receives sufficient resources in relation to the student population it is required to serve. The resources must enable each program to effectively operate in terms of coordination, recruitment, advisement, program development and instruction.

ACCREDITATION TEAM

State Team Leader: **Joel Colbert** (Team Co-Chair)
Chapman University

NCATE Team Leader   **Brigitte G. Valesey** (Team Co-Chair and
Common Standards Cluster Leader)

Widener University

NCATE/Common Standards Cluster:

Katherine E. Cummings (NCATE Member)
Western Michigan University

Eric C. Stemle (NCATE Member)
Evanston High School

Kelly W. Ryan (NCATE Member)
Jacksonville State University

Donald Davis (NCATE Member)
Mobridge School District, South Dakota

Stephen Christensen (NCATE Member)
Boise State University

Iris Riggs (CCTC/COA Member)
California State University, San Bernardino

Carl R. V. Brown (CCTC/COA Member)
California State University, Stanislaus

Basic Credential Cluster:

Reyes Quezada, (Cluster Leader)
University of San Diego

Denise Fleming
California State University, East Bay

David Tamori
Oroville High School

Mary Humphreys
Buena Park School District

Gloria Guzman-Johannesen
Cal Poly, Pomona

Michele Britton Bass
Antioch University

Pam Driscoll

Azusa Unified School District

Jane Vogel
Independent Consultant

Kathee Christensen
San Diego State University

David Simmons
Ventura County Office of Education

Services Credential Cluster:

Lori Kim, (Cluster Leader)
California State University, Los Angeles

Cynthia Fernandes
Vasquez High School

Christy Reinold
Lodi Unified School District

Mark Fulmer
Kern County Superintendent of Schools

Sharon Rogers
Will C. Wood Middle School

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

University Catalog
Institutional Self Study
Course Syllabi
Candidate Files
Fieldwork Handbooks
Course Materials
Information Booklets
Field Experience Notebooks
Schedule of Classes
Advisement Documents
Faculty Vitae

Portfolios
Candidate Work Samples
Exit Surveys
Assessment Data
Follow-up Survey Results
Reports

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Team Leader	Common Stands. Cluster	Basic Credential Cluster	Services Credential Cluster	TOTAL
Program Faculty	80	41	102	28	**251**
Institutional Administration	6	3	16	11	**36**
Candidates	57	2	192	58	**309**
Graduates	22	5	36	36	**99**
Employers of Graduates	13	2	28	18	**61**
Supervising Practitioners	28	8	28	18	**82**
Advisors	15	0	29	13	**57**
School Administrators	12	3	24	15	**54**
Credential Analyst	2	0	2	2	**6**
Tech Support	0	3	0	0	**3**
Advisory Committee	19	2	21	24	**66**
				TOTAL	**1024**

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

NCATE STANDARDS/CCTC COMMON STANDARDS

STANDARD 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

> *Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.*

Level: Initial and Advanced

Introduction

As a member of the California State University system, SFSU uses the California State University system-wide matched survey of employers and CSU graduates of its initial teacher preparation programs. Near the end of their first year of teaching, CSU graduates and the principals who evaluate their classroom performance are asked to evaluate the effectiveness of their preparation to teach. The survey focuses on subject matter knowledge; preparation to teach reading, mathematics, and other areas of the curriculum; preparation to effectively teach students with special educational needs and English learners; preparation in classroom management; preparation to assess student learning; and other critical dimensions of effective teaching.

The unit receives a detailed annual report from the CSU system Chancellor's office. The report includes not only SFSU data for all of its initial teacher credential programs, but also the aggregate data of the other 22 CSU campuses for comparison. In addition, each campus annually submits an accountability report to the CSU Chancellor's Office on the ways in which evaluation findings are used for program improvement. As a result of the evaluation, two system-wide initiatives were launched to address areas in need of improvement, according to survey data—one in the area of secondary reading methods and one in the area of teaching special needs students in regular education classrooms. The unit participated in these professional development opportunities which brought together CSU faculty to discuss, share, and plan for future action actions on their own campuses. In addition, the Chancellor's office facilitated a professional development conference in Spring, 2007 to bring together teacher education faculty from across the CSU system to address system-wide improvement areas indicated in the survey.

In 2007 the unit's dean began to require that each initial teacher credential program analyze the CSU survey data annually, and develop a plan that identifies at least two areas for program improvement, including a timeline and faculty responsibilities for implementing the plan. A follow-up report of results will also be required.

The unit also uses a locally-developed exit survey of all graduates of credential, masters and doctoral programs. The results of the exit survey are aggregated annually and analyzed by administration and faculty to identify areas where program improvement is needed. A report summarizing exit survey data from 2003-2004 was made available to the BOE. Unit-level findings for curriculum and field experience variables were reported in two sections—one for all credential (initial teacher preparation) programs and the other for all graduate degree programs. In each case, assessed items related to the categories of quality of faculty and instruction, advising, curriculum content, and field experience. Credential graduates of the college reported

feeling most prepared to *engage students in learning in a supportive manner, reflect on their own practice, collaborate with colleagues, and create and maintain an effective environment for learning.* On average, it was reported that students felt less prepared to *understand school, district, and other organizational structures, to understand educational policies and legal implications of schooling, and to design and develop technology-based instruction.*

In the area of graduate programs, *encouragement of student participation* was ranked highest by respondents while the lowest evaluation related to *class organization.* Annual survey results from 1999 to 2006 are cited within the report and used to identify trends. Program level findings are also reported for each program of the college, again in the same four areas of quality of faculty and instruction, advising, curriculum content, and field experience.

A.   Content knowledge for teacher candidates

As mandated by the state of California, candidates for teacher education programs must demonstrate subject matter knowledge through tests or other measures. Prior to admission to the teacher education program, Multiple Subject (elementary) candidates must pass the California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET). Candidates seeking the Single Subject (secondary) credential or Level I Educational Specialist: Special Education credential may demonstrate subject matter competency by passing the appropriate CSET exam or by taking a CCTC-approved subject matter program in one of the following subject areas: English, Social Studies, Math, Science, Art, Physical Education, Music, or Foreign Language. As an entrance requirement, CSET pass rates for candidates in the programs are 100%. Evidence of content test results was provided through federal Title II reports.

Course syllabi indicate that additional assessments of content knowledge are embedded in course assignments, portfolios, and evaluations of clinical experiences. Rubrics have been developed for most of the assessments, although results of the identified assessments were not aggregated consistently across program areas. Programs in Special Education and School Psychology were noted as maintaining databases with assessment results for their candidates.

The Institutional Report identified assessments of content knowledge for initial preparation which include grades, portfolios, field experience evaluations, and follow up surveys of graduates and employers. Aggregated data from the assessments were not systematically compiled at the unit level. Individual program areas varied in their use of assessment data for program improvement, with minutes of faculty meetings providing evidence that some programs had discussed the results of assessments.

In advanced programs, candidates must have a grade point average of at least 2.5 and an earned degree from an accredited institution for admission. Candidates are interviewed prior to admission. Candidates for advanced programs provide letters of recommendation used in the admissions decision and submit written statements of purpose. Individual programs establish additional admission requirements and set standards for continuation within a program. Candidates are reviewed formally by academic advisors during the process of preparing the plan of study and the proposal for culminating experience. This process of assessment by the advisor was cited as a key aspect of assessment in the Institutional Report and verified through faculty and candidate interviews.

The Institutional Report indicated that all graduate degree programs are required to prepare outcomes assessment reports annually. Samples of the annual reports were provided in the electronic and onsite exhibits. The annual reports reflected results of survey data for each program but did not include data from course-embedded or programmatic content assessments.

Interviews with candidates, alumni, and employers suggested that candidates demonstrate high levels of content knowledge. Each group of individuals reported strongly positive evaluations of candidates' content knowledge. Moreover, alumni stated that they were likely to return to SFSU for further education, with one individual expressing disappointment that he was unable to return to the unit for his advanced degree.

The California State University system gathers data on the effectiveness of program graduates through surveys of teachers and employers. The unit reports high levels of satisfaction with the content preparation received by candidates from both employers and program graduates. As described in the introduction to Standard One, SFSU participates in the CSU annual survey of its initial teacher preparation completers late in their first year of teaching. Based upon these matched data, the unit reports that:

"Highest degrees of perceived effectiveness were reported in the teaching of Mathematics (K-8), where 78% of respondents indicated that teachers and their employers felt that they were "Well Prepared" or "Adequately Prepared," and Mathematics (7-12), where 76% reported similarly. There was cause for some concern in the figures on teaching English (7-12), which showed a decline to 65% "Well Prepared" or "Adequately Prepared" in 04-05, and these findings are being shared and discussed with the SFSU English Department, which has the responsibility for delivering the subject matter content instruction at SFSU." (IR, pg 24).

Program Review Results:

The California protocol for NCATE accreditation calls for a joint visit with state and national reviewers. Program reviews undertaken at the time of the current visit resulted in the following decisions:

Programs	Review Decision
Teaching Cluster	
Multiple Subject	Two standards met with concerns
Multiple Subject with Internship	
Multiple Subject BCLAD	
Single Subject	One standard not met
Single Subject with Internship	
Mild/Moderate Disabilities- Level I	Five standards met with concerns
Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship – Level I	
Mild/Moderate Disabilities- Level II	
Moderate/Severe Disabilities - Level I	Two standards met with concerns
Moderate/Severe Disabilities Internship - Level I	
Moderate/Severe Disabilities - Level II	
Deaf & Hard of Hearing - Level I	Multiple standards met with concerns, one standard not met
Deaf & Hard of Hearing - Level II	
Early Childhood Special Education – Level I	All standards met
Early Childhood Special Education - Level II	

Programs	Review Decision
Level I Physical & Health Impairments	All standards met
Level II Physical & Health Impairments	
Visual Impairment- Level I	All standards met
Visual Impairment- Level II	
Reading Certificate	Two standards not met
Reading Language Arts Specialist Credential	
Vocational Education	Two standards met with concerns
Adult Education	All standards met
Adapted Physical Education	All standards met
Advanced/Services Cluster	
Preliminary Administrative	One standard met with concerns and eight standards not met
Preliminary Administrative Internship	
Professional Administrative	
PPS-School Counseling	All standards met
PPS-School Counseling Internship	
PPS-School Psychology	All standards met
PPS-School Psychology Internship	
PPS-School Social Work	All standards met
Language Speech & Hearing	All standards met
Special Class Authorization (Aphasia)	
Audiology	
Orientation & Mobility	All standards met

Programs within the unit also have been approved or accredited by the appropriate agency, including the following:

- American Speech Language Hearing Association (ASHA): Programs in Communicative Disorders, Department of Special Education, were evaluated and received continuing accreditation.
- Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP): Programs from the Department of Counseling, in the College of Health and Human Services, were evaluated and accredited by CACREP. This includes the Pupil Personnel Services and the School Counseling Credential Program.
- Council for the Education of the Deaf (CED): The Deaf/Hard of Hearing Program is a CED approved teacher preparation program.
- National Association for School Psychologists (NASP): Programs in the Department of Psychology, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences were accredited by NASP. Programs reviewed by NASP include the Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology and School Psychology Internship.

B.   Content knowledge of other school personnel

The Institutional Report (pg 26) lists the following as opportunities for assessment of content knowledge for other school personnel:

GPA	Portfolios
Teaching Experience	Case Studies
Personal Essay	Exams
Recommendation Letters	Culminating Experiences
Program Application	Graduate Exit Surveys
Course Assignments/Projects	

Interviews with faculty, staff, and students indicated that data from these assessment opportunities are not systematically compiled or aggregated at the unit level. Examination of course syllabi and program review materials revealed sample rubrics for assignments and projects. Syllabi did not consistently identify whether assignments were considered key assessments for the programs or unit. Data from assessments were available in some program reports but were not presented for the unit as a whole.

The sample assessments and rubrics provided for the team indicated satisfactory levels of candidate performance. The use of assessment data varies within and among individual program areas, although interviews with candidates and faculty suggest that assessment data are shared informally during faculty meetings or other discussions. The limited availability of aggregated data or systematic analysis of assessment results at the unit level prevented the team from determining whether the unit as a whole uses its assessment system to make decisions or improvements.

C.   Pedagogical content knowledge for teachers

Assessments related to pedagogical content knowledge were not identified as such in unit documents. Examination of course syllabi and other program review materials indicated that assignments and projects within courses and field experiences may provide the opportunity for gathering evidence related to candidate performance in pedagogical content knowledge. Evidence from these opportunities was not aggregated or analyzed at the unit level. Within program areas, assignments and projects tend to be reviewed by faculty and candidates on an individual basis to provide feedback for candidates

Programs in the unit rely on exit surveys and the CSU system-wide follow-up surveys of candidates and employers to inform the program review and improvement processes. Upon request of the BOE team, the unit provided access to the SFSU College of Education's 2006 annual response to the *CSU Systemwide Survey* which identifies trends within results from its initial programs since 2001. Data are collected from employers and program graduates after one year of teaching.   Survey questions address the effectiveness of each credential category overall and preparation to perform 18 specific teaching duties, including the ability to teach key content areas, plan instruction, manage instruction, use instructional technologies, address equity and diversity, teach English language learners, and teach learners with special needs.

 Additionally, ratings were provided regarding the overall value of program area's coursework and of the fieldwork. The unit's 2006 annual report provides a brief summary overview of each area's results since 2001-2002. The unit is requesting that the CSU Chancellor's Office provide

further disaggregated findings in order to more easily identify strengths and weaknesses by specific programs. For example, within Special Education, SFSU offers numerous types of credentials.

Interviews with candidates, school partners, and faculty indicate a high level of satisfaction with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of candidates from the unit. Few direct measures of candidate performance on assessments of knowledge, skills, and dispositions were available for review by the BOE team. However, the unit did provide evidence of student performance data collected within some programs. For example, results for an Elementary Math Teaching Event completed by students within a recent cohort provides an indication that some programs are moving toward the use of data and also electronically collecting it. Interviews with faculty and program administrators provided additional evidence that programs are moving forward with the development of direct measures of candidate performance on the Teacher Performance Expectations.

D. Professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills for teachers

The Multiple Subject (elementary education) Program Action Plan of 2006-2007 cited preparation to manage instruction as an area of need, based on results from the CSU Survey. The percentage of candidates indicating satisfactory preparation for instructional management has decreased from 80% to 64% between 2001 and the most recent survey results. The action plan outlines a series of remedies including increased seminar units with additional focus on classroom management and in-service training of faculty. Additionally, the action plan identifies preparation to teach English Learners as an area for attention. The number of candidates considered well prepared to teach English learners has dropped from 47% to 25% since 2001. Planned actions include examination of courses to ensure that lesson plans include written evaluations. Finally, the Multiple Subject (elementary education) program selected preparation to use educational technology as a third area of focus. They intend to implement a 3-unit course in technology rather than the presently used 1-unit course and to schedule regular meetings between technology faculty and elementary education faculty.

The Single Subject (secondary education) Program Action Plan of 2006-2007 identifies two broad areas as concerns: overall value of professional coursework in education and overall value of professional fieldwork in the credential program. These focus areas were identified based on four years of CSU Survey results showing 63 -77% of students responding that they were "well or adequately prepared" in professional coursework while 66-77% of students during the same time period indicated that they were "well or adequately prepared" in their fieldwork. In response to the survey results, faculty have identified possible actions, including a comprehensive review of secondary education programs through focus groups of master teachers, university supervisors, and program graduates; a survey of first semester candidates; implementation of a professional development day for faculty in fall 2007; and a survey of master teachers and university supervisors to evaluate the effectiveness of a newly implemented supervision model.

The Special Education programs also completed a Program Action Plan in Response to the CSU System-wide Evaluation which identified two areas of focus—candidate preparedness to teach English Language Learners and candidate preparedness to teach mathematics (K-8). The percentage of students and employers reporting that candidates were "well or adequately prepared" in the area of teaching English Language Learners decreased from 76% to 69% since

2001-2002. The program has already reviewed and revised the content of an existing course and added a new course: *English Language Learning & Exceptionality*. Additionally, the Special Education Department indicated its intention to add language acquisition- related questions to its student exit survey. The second area of focus was selected due to a decrease in the number of candidates and employers stating that candidates were "well or adequately prepared" to teach mathematics. Percentages dropped from a high of 78% in 2001-2002 to 60% in 2004-2005. Following the release of the survey data, faculty reviewed a current mathematics course and are considering the development of a course specific to the needs of special education candidates.

The CSU Survey of graduates and their supervisors includes assessment of the effectiveness of SFSU-prepared teachers to support equity and diversity and to teach English language learners. Results since 2001 indicate that 75%-85% of respondents believed that they were adequately or well-prepared to address equity and diversity issues within the classroom. Seventy-eight to 84% of respondents reported that they were adequately or well-prepared to teach English Language Learners. The data suggest that over time, there is strong consensus that teachers and their employers judge their preparation to have been strong in this area. The unit notes, however, that there has been a downward trend in these figures, and reports that departments are discussing curricular implications of these patterns in order to address them in the curriculum.

According to the unit, findings from the College of Education's exit survey suggest a high degree of overall student satisfaction with the quality of the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills they have developed in the program. As noted in the survey report for 2003-04,

> "Mean scores reported reveal that as a result of coursework and field experience, graduates feel most prepared to 'engage students in learning in a supportive manner' (Mean = 4.38), 'reflect on their own practice' (Mean = 4.35), 'collaborate with colleagues' (Mean = 4.28), and 'create and maintain an effective environment for learning.' On average, graduates appear to feel less prepared to 'address different levels of disability' (Mean=3.82), 'design and develop technology-based instruction' (Mean=3.80), and 'engage families and communities in student learning'(Mean=3.80."

The final item listed in this domain, concerning the level of satisfaction with the overall quality of the professional preparation in the respondent's major program area, has produced relatively consistent mean ratings from graduates: In AY 1999-00, the mean response was 3.92 (s.d.=0.89) compared to 3.85 (s.d.=0.92) and 3.94 (s.d.=0.96) in AY 2000-01 and 2001-02, respectively. For AY 02-03 it was 4.03, which was a slight gain, and for AY 03-04 it was 3.90 (s.d=.84), which was in line with most prior scores in this area.

Direct measures of candidate performance in pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills are embedded within courses and field experiences through assignments and projects. The assignments, projects, and expectations for courses and field experiences are linked with the state-wide Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE), as demonstrated on program-level matrices provided within program review documents. Some of these TPEs reflect pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

E.   Professional knowledge and skills for other school personnel

Unit and program documents did not clearly identify assessments related to professional knowledge and skills for other school personnel. Examination of course syllabi and other program review materials included assignments and projects that provide the opportunity for gathering evidence related to candidates' professional knowledge and skills. Evidence from these opportunities was not collected, aggregated or analyzed at the unit level. Within program areas, assignments and projects tend to be reviewed by faculty and candidates on an individual basis to provide feedback for candidates. Interviews with faculty suggested that faculty members share information and impressions from class assignments with colleagues in informal settings or during regularly scheduled meetings. However, the sharing of information was not identified as part of a systematic process of assessment and program improvement.

Results from surveys of candidates, graduates and employers reflect overall satisfaction with candidates' professional knowledge and skills. As noted throughout the discussion of Standard 1, the unit's assessment reports and plans have been based on survey data rather than on results of direct measures of knowledge and skills. However, interviews with candidates, faculty, and school partners support the positive survey results.

F.   Dispositions

The unit indicates that professional dispositions are assessed at the time of admission to initial and advanced programs through reference letters and candidate interviews. Sample rubrics provided to the BOE team reflect dispositional issues although dispositions are not articulated. The unit has not aggregated or systematically analyzed results from the rubrics used during the admissions process. Sample rubrics and evaluation forms examined by the BOE team did not specify expected candidate dispositions. As noted throughout the discussion of Standard 1, the unit relies heavily on the results of follow-up surveys of graduates and employers to provide evidence of candidate performance.

Direct measures of dispositions are only sporadically included in the assignments and projects described in course syllabi and program review materials. Results of any direct measures of dispositions are not aggregated or analyzed systematically at the unit level. However, candidates and school partners consistently cited the unit's emphasis on issues of diversity and social justice as a strength for which the unit is known among its stakeholders. State level program reviewers expressed their satisfaction with the unit's assessment of candidate dispositions. While anecdotal evidence and interviews with school partners support the unit's efforts to assist candidates in the development of professional dispositions, little documentation of candidate dispositions is maintained by the unit.

G.   Student learning for teacher candidates

Assessments related to student learning for teacher candidates, while not identified as such in unit documents, are described in course syllabi and other program review materials through assignments and projects. Evidence from these assessment opportunities was not collected, aggregated or analyzed at the unit level. Within program areas, assignments and projects typically are reviewed by faculty and candidates on an individual basis to provide feedback and advisement. Faculty members described opportunities to share information and impressions from class assignments in informal settings or during regularly scheduled meetings.

Interviews with candidates, graduates, and school partners indicate positive assessments of candidate abilities to assess student learning, use assessments in instruction, and develop meaningful learning experiences. Moreover, state team members determined that candidates within various teacher preparation programs met most state standards related to student learning. Follow up surveys of graduates and employers from 2001 to the present indicate overall satisfaction with candidate performance and preparation in the knowledge and skills related to student learning. However, the unit provided little documentation of formal assessments related to student learning across all programs within the unit.

H.   Student learning for other school personnel

Unit documents did not identify specific assessments related to student learning for other school personnel. Team members found descriptions of assignments and projects that could be used to gather evidence related to student learning within syllabi for programs preparing other school personnel. Evidence from the assignments was not collected, aggregated or analyzed at the unit level. Within program areas, student work may be reviewed by faculty and candidates on an individual basis to provide candidate feedback and advisement. Interviews with faculty suggested information is often shared with colleagues in informal settings or during regularly scheduled meetings.

Interviews with candidates, graduates, and school partners indicate positive assessments of candidate abilities to develop meaningful learning experiences within their professional practice. Program reviewers from the state determined that candidates within most preparation programs for other school personnel met state standards related to student learning. Exit and follow-up surveys support the assessment that graduates from programs preparing other school personnel are able to create positive learning environments. Little formal assessment data related to this element were available to BOE team members.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Interviews conducted onsite during the BOE team visit provided consistently positive evaluations of candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Course syllabi and program review materials provide input-based evidence of opportunities to develop professional knowledge and skills as well as opportunities for candidates to demonstrate their knowledge and skills related to content, pedagogy, and assessment of student learning. Follow-up surveys of program graduates and their employers as well as exit surveys of candidates in advanced programs indicate positive perceptions of candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions. However, results of direct measures of candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions are not regularly available for review by the unit and were not available for review by the BOE team. The unit's management and use of assessment data appear to rely heavily on results from exit and follow-up surveys.

NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

Areas for Improvement:

New

1.   Some programs offered by the unit do not fully meet state standards for program approval.
Rationale:
State reviews completed at the time of the visit indicated standards not met within the following program areas: Single Subject, Reading, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, and Administration. Other program areas were met with concerns: Multiple Subject, Moderate/Severe, and Vocational.

2.   There is limited documentation related to candidate demonstrations of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions delineated in state standards related to pedagogical content knowledge, professional knowledge for other school personnel, and student learning for teachers and other school personnel
Rationale:
Documentation of direct measures of candidate performance delineated in state standards was maintained only sporadically across programs within the unit.

3.   Candidate dispositions are not clearly articulated in all programs within the unit and are not formally assessed after program admission.
Rationale:
Letters of reference used for admission to programs are cited as the sole formal assessment of candidate dispositions for the unit as a whole.

Continued: None

Corrected: None

State Team Decision: Standard Met with Concerns
    While there is substantial candidate assessment data collected for most programs, data are not systematically summarized and used by the unit.

STANDARD 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

> *The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on the applicant qualifications, the candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.*

Level: Initial and Advanced

A.   Assessment system

The unit has assessment procedures that have been in place for many years. These procedures are designed to measure candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Assessment procedures are decentralized and independently established by individual programs. They have evolved as additional requirements are placed on the unit for assessment by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. For example, as the California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) were adopted, programs in the unit began piloting the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA), the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT), or Task Stream. Different programs were adapting different assessments, all of which are aligned with the TPEs. The procedures are designed to assess candidates at 1) entrance into the program; 2) through the program; 3) at completion of the program; 4) and one year after completion.

As described in the conceptual framework, unit incorporates the California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) and the six California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) into field experiences and coursework. These standards, which codify the nature of professional competence, are then identified on course syllabi, handbooks, and assessments. The TPEs and CSTP as part of the credentialing process, together with the understanding of California's learning to teach continuum and the state's Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program, aligns the initial preparation candidates receive with the ongoing professional development through induction that they will receive when employed by public school districts.

Initial Program

The BOE team was provided with documents showing alignment of assessments with standards that measure the knowledge, skills, and dispositions identified in the unit's conceptual framework. This includes the four transition points where these assessments are administered. The transition points for the initial program are as follow:

1. Entry
    - GPA
    - California Basic Education Skills Test (CBEST)
    - California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET) or CCTC approved Subject Matter Program
    - Narrative Essay
    - Student/school observation
    - Interview
    - Recommendations
2. Matriculation
    - GPA
    - Course Assignments/Grades

- Embedded Assessments
- Portfolios
- Field Experience Evaluations
- Evaluations
- Portfolios
- Observations
3. Program Completion
   - Course Assignments/Grades
   - Embedded Assessments
   - Portfolios
   - Field Experience Evaluations
   - TPA-Teaching Performance Assessments/PACT Teaching Event/iCAP
4. Follow-Up
   - CSU Survey
   - Candidate Survey

Advanced Programs

There are four transition points for the advanced programs (the Master's degrees, the ESL program specialist certificate, the Curriculum and Instruction Supervisory Certificate), generally, the same steps and admission process as described in the initial programs are involved, with the exception that admission to the College and admission to candidacy are combined.
1. Entry
   - GPA
   - Initial Degree
   - Professional Experience
   - Personal Essay
   - Interview
   - Recommendation Letters
   - Program Application
2. Matriculation
   - GPA
   - Course Assignments/Projects
   - Graduate Approved Program (GAP)
   - Proposal for Culminating Experience
   - Portfolios
   - Observation
   - Case Studies
   - Exams
3. Completion
   - Culminating Experience
   - Case Study
4. Follow Up
   - Graduate Exit Survey

Initial and Advanced

Candidates must meet admission criteria prior to being admitted into any program. Once they are in the program they must maintain the expected standard. Candidates may complete their programs only upon successful completion of all expectations. In addition to the criteria listed above, each candidate for initial credentialing must also pass U.S. Constitution coursework or an examination.

A Special Admissions program is available to candidates who do not meet all the previously-stated qualifications for admission, but who otherwise present a promising profile. This

procedure requires review and approval by the program faculty and department chair. Title V of the Education Code and Executive Order #476 from the Chancellor's Office specifies that no more than 15% of candidates for any program can be admitted through this process. Candidates admitted through this process must complete all requirements of the program prior to recommendation for a credential or award of a degree. Conditional admission for such candidates is also an option, requiring that specific additional conditions be met prior to recommendation for the credential or graduate degree completion.

Candidates' progress is monitored throughout their programs using transition points established by individual programs. Generally, a candidate is assigned an advisor upon admission into a particular credential or degree program. This ongoing advisement by individual faculty provides one type of quality check on candidate progress. Grades are also used as indicators of progress. Each semester, program faculty review candidates whose cumulative GPA falls below the required norm in order to remain in good standing. These candidates are sent a letter of probation, notifying them of the requirement to maintain a 3.0 GPA for credential and graduate degree candidates to continue in their programs. A candidate is placed on probation for two semesters, at which time the problem must be resolved and the appropriate GPA achieved or the candidate becomes eligible for disqualification from the program. The candidate is referred to the faculty advisor to discuss the problem and secure assistance in developing an appropriate remediation.

Evidence with confirming interviews indicate the unit has adopted measures to ensure that its assessment procedures are fair accurate, consistent, and free of bias. For example, rubrics are used both to evaluate application materials and also during screening interviews. In addition rubrics are used throughout the program to guide those making assessment decisions. To ensure the validity of the PACT assessment procedures, faculty members attended "train the trainer" workshops and then returned to campus to train other faculty members.

Through evidence provided, there is usually alignment between program assessment criteria and the program standards. Even though quantitative data were not available, through interviews, the faculty members indicated that triangulation among assessments would indicate key assessments are predictors of candidate success. Multiple snapshots, whether from university supervisors, faculty members who teach courses, employer surveys, alumni surveys or the CU Teacher Education Survey, would all indicate success.

Exit surveys, faculty evaluations and course evaluations are three of the assessment sources cited to manage and improve the operations and programs of the unit. For example, exit surveys have been used to assess the efficiency and openness of the Credentialing Office. Faculty evaluations have been used to provide direction to individual faculty members.

B.   Data collection, analysis, and evaluation

Initial and Advanced
Entrance requirements and course grades are maintained each semester. Reflected in this assessment would be the assignments and projects expected in each course. Portfolios may be required prior to moving to another level. To complete the program candidates must demonstrate they have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required by the State of California. The Unit Exit Survey of Graduates is completed at the time of credentialing. The California

Systemwide Evaluation of Teacher Preparation survey is completed after the candidate has been teaching for one year by both the alumnus and the employer.

The Credential Services Teacher Preparation Center (CSTPC) gathers, tracks, maintains, and reports data related to candidates' qualifications and performances for admission into and exiting from credentialing programs. The Providers of Educational Technology Services (POETS) develops the technological infrastructure of multiple data reporting systems. The NCATE coordinator and the Graduate Dean of Graduate Studies oversee the assessment system and coordinate with others in the unit.

Even though the unit maintains assessment procedures, there is no defined structure in place by which the unit aggregates, analyzes, or reports assessment data such as student teaching assessments, portfolio results, or interview rubric scores. Currently data is maintained on a program-by-program basis. For example student teaching data is maintained in individual program databases. Reports are generated as needed by each program and reported to the dean's office as requested. This data may be summarized through reports, tables, charts, or graphs depending on the intended use of the data. The unit relies heavily on the California Systemwide Evaluation of Teacher Preparation survey to guide decision-making. The data from this report are provided to the dean's office, which then disseminates the data to individual programs through each department. For example, unit wide aggregated data reports on student teaching placements by school, CBEST scores, or GPA's were not available to the BOE team. There is no system in place to aggregate data on how well candidates perform on specific standards within the assessments completed. For example, the ability to work with all students is an expected outcome throughout many courses and assessments. However, no aggregated data were presented on how well candidates perform on this standard. Portfolios illustrate the impact candidates have on student learning, but no aggregated data were presented on how well candidates perform on this standard. Aggregated data on pedagogical content knowledge, professional knowledge, and dispositions were not available.

The Credential Services Teacher Preparation Center (CSTPC) maintains a Filemaker Pro database of admission and exiting data for candidates in the credentialing programs. Administrators and faculty have access to this database to view student information. Other than this database, the information technologies used to maintain the assessment system varies depending upon what is available in each program or data source. There is no central system for data analysis. The CSTPC is able to generate reports related to admission numbers by programs and credentialing such as first time or preliminary credentials or out of state verifications.

A record of formal candidate complaints and their resolution is maintained in the associate dean's office. Candidate complaints are handled following University protocol. Complaints and grievance guidelines and procedures are spelled out in the University Bulletin.

C. Use of data for program improvement

Initial and Advanced
From discussions with faculty it was determined that they use assessment data on a regular basis while advising candidates. The information is provided in individual paper format and referred to by the advisor as needed. The dean and department chairs use faculty and course evaluations in working with faculty.

Primary sources of data to discuss and initiate program or unit changes on a regular basis are the California Systemwide Evaluation of Teacher Preparation survey and the Unit Exit Survey of Graduates. The dean's office provides this data to each department chair on a yearly basis. The department chairs are required to review the data and establish two areas for improvement. The chairs are then required to report back to the dean's office in the fall on how well they have met their intended outcome. Needs assessments are conducted as needed. Because aggregated data is not available many decisions are made based upon personal opinion and discussions. Two examples of specific changes have been made as a result of needs assessment analysis. One example involved the decision to create an Ed.D. in Leadership independent of UC Berkley. This decision was made based upon on a review of available resources and a needs assessment in the community. Another change involved the increase in writing emphasis and an early introduction to research in the elementary program based upon an analysis of culminating experiences.

Assessment data is shared with candidates during advising sessions with program faculty. Faculty members receive available assessment data through the department chair and/or program director. They may also receive available assessment data through committee assignments, for example serving on the College Curriculum Committee or the Teacher Credentialing Committee. Other stakeholders receive assessment data through participation on advisory committees.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit has assessment procedures in place that use key assessments to determine candidate performance made at admission into programs, at appropriate transition points, and at program completion and beyond at individual program levels. The unit lacks a unit wide, systematic system to regularly and systematically gather, summarize, analyze and use data, including candidate and graduate performance information, to evaluate the efficacy of its courses, programs, and clinical experiences and analyze program evaluation and performance assessment data to initiate changes where called for by analysis of unit level aggregated data.

NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard NOT MET

Areas for Improvement:

Initial and Advanced

New

1. *The unit does not have an integrated set of evaluation measures that are used to monitor candidate performance and manage and improve unit operations and program activities across programs.*

Rationale: The unit has a decentralized and independent series of procedures to monitor candidate performance and manage and improve operations and programs for each program within the unit.

2. *Data are not regularly and systematically compiled, summarized, and analyzed to improve candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations across all programs.*

Rationale: The aggregation and dissemination of demographic and assessment data were not consistently available in a regular and systematic way across all programs.

3. *The unit does not maintain an assessment system that provides regular and comprehensive information on candidate proficiencies from program assessments.*

Rationale: Aggregated data were not available on how well candidates performed during the program on specific standards.

4. *The unit does not regularly and systematically use aggregated candidate performance data to evaluate the efficacy of its courses, programs, and clinical experiences across all programs.*

Rationale: Aggregated candidate performance data were not available.

Continued

Initial

Program evaluation data are not systematically used in all credential programs to ensure continuous program improvements.

Rationale: The aggregation, analysis, and dissemination of demographic and assessment data were not consistently available in a regular and systematic way across credential programs.

State Team Decision: Standard Met with Concerns

Data are collected programmatically but are not used to inform the unit where changes are needed. There a lack of evidence that a program assessment systems is utilized across the unit.

Rationale: The state requirement for meeting this standard is substantially different from that of NCATE. At present, the state standard requires that designated stakeholders (program participants, graduates and local practitioners) are involved in a comprehensive evaluation of courses and field experiences that lead to substantive improvements in credential programs. It was judged that evaluation data are collected from stakeholders, but evidence of the coordination and utilization of that data was not available.

STANDARD 3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

Level: (Initial and Advanced)

A.   Collaboration between unit and partners

The unit's field and clinical experiences are designed, delivered, and evaluated by the collaboration of unit faculty, coordinators, and supervisors; site administrators in local school districts; the Student Teaching Coordinating Council of the San Francisco Unified School District; the Liberal Studies Council, which includes two member of the Department of Elementary Education; and the Advisory Board to the Department of Secondary Education which includes school administrators, district support staff, teachers, members of single subject department faculties, and representatives from the class of candidates.

The collaboration of these various partners has resulted in changes in the operations of field experience and clinical practice. One example involved meetings that included members of the Department of Secondary Education and school district personnel to review and make recommendations to supervised fieldwork standards. Topics discussed included opportunities for candidates to experience all phases of an academic year in a school setting, the implementation of Teaching Performance Assessments, and the provision for professional development for induction programs.

Partners are involved in field placement. In some programs such as Single Subject Credential or Multiple Subject Credential, the field placement coordinator works in concert with school district administrators, department chairs, and master teachers to match candidates with appropriate mentors.   The *Single Subject Credential Teaching Handbook* clearly delineates the responsibilities of the coordinator, university field supervisor, and the master teacher, as well as the qualifications for the master teacher. Placement for the placement in other credential areas is the responsibility of program chairs working in collaboration with school partners.

Candidates are placed in clinical practice according to a number of factors that include
o   an expressed preference for a particular area, master teacher, or school by credential candidates
o   the availability of experienced and qualified master teachers
o   the availability of subject and grade level appropriate placements
o   geographic location

B. Design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice

The unit provides field experience and clinical practice across a number of credential programs. Students complete 45 hours of observation in classrooms or specialized settings before being admitted to the teacher education programs. While the basic design of the clinical practicum experience consists of one semester of observation and participation with some lesson planning and delivery followed by a semester of student teaching, some programs provide candidates with an option of completing their field experience over three semesters. Due to a variety of requirements specified by the adopted state standards defined by the Commission on Teaching Credentialing, the organization of field experience and clinical practice is divided among the following programs:

Multiple Subject Credential
Single Subject Credential
Mild/Moderate Disabilities (Initial)
Mild/ Moderate Disabilities (Advanced)
Moderate/Severe Disabilities (Initial)
Moderate/Severe Disabilities (Advanced)
Deaf and Hard of Hearing (Initial)
Deaf and Hard of Hearing (Advanced)
Early Childhood Special Education (Initial)
Early Child Special Education (Advanced)
Physical and Health Impairments (Initial)
Physical and Health Impairments (Advanced)
Visual Impairments (Initial)
Visual Impairments (Advanced)
Reading Certificate (Advanced)
Adapted Physical Education
Vocational Education
Adult Education
Educational Specialist
Educational Administration
School Counseling
School Psychology

For Single Subject Credential and Multiple Subject Credential candidates, Phase I of Clinical Practice involves nine hours of observation and participation per week during this first semester and the conducting of activities assigned by their Curriculum and Instruction course instructors. In the first seven weeks of Phase II, candidates spend nine hours per week in observation and conduct a solo three lesson sequence that is evaluated by their master teachers. The next eight weeks are spent in full-time student teaching that includes two weeks of solo teaching. University field supervisors visit candidates on site twice each semester to assess their progress and provide evaluative feedback. Field and clinical experiences for these programs total 445 hours. Other programs have varied practicum requirements. The Educational Specialist program requires 315 hours, School Counseling 820 hours, and School Psychology 1296 hours.

Candidates in the Single Subject Credential and Multiple Credential programs are required to meet 13 Teaching Performance Expectations during their field experience, and they demonstrate those proficiencies through the completion of a portfolio. Included in the portfolio are work samples, reflections, and documentation of proficiency for each TPE.

Candidates complete a course in instructional technology prior to their year of clinical practice. Most but not all cooperative schools provide candidates with technological resources ranging from computer grading and communication systems to PowerPoint and word processing labs. Some schools are not equipped with much electronic technology, and therefore the quality of candidate experiences with technology in the schools is inconsistent.

Master teachers (cooperating teachers) are identified for the most part by their school administrators and department heads and invited to participate in the teacher education program. A master teacher is selected on the basis of
o a minimum of three years of post-credential teaching experience
o a credential in the subject area he/she is teaching
o professional training in student teacher preparation
o a personal dedication and professional commitment to the training of student teachers
o the site administrator's recommendation regarding successful supervision of previous candidates or strong potential for supervision of a beginning teacher

While master teachers are selected by school personnel, those partners work in conjunction with unit coordinators for approval. Some coordinators are active in visiting schools and maintaining contact with principals, department heads, and master teachers. They also consult with unit faculty regarding appropriate placement for candidates. The unit's *Exit Survey of Graduates* annual reports for 2000-2004 reveal a consistent and high rating for the quality of mentors and master teachers in both initial and advanced program field experiences.

Master teachers in the Single Subject Credential program receive the *Student Teacher Handbook*, course syllabi, and student materials that include a description of how the field experiences are connected to the courses candidates are taking as well as guidelines for mentoring. Some master teachers have requested more training in the form of workshops and meetings designed to give them increased communication with each other and with university field supervisors and unit instructors.

The Secondary Education Department has begun discussions with district administrators about jointly offering weekend workshops for master teachers, new and experienced, but there is no evidence indicating that that training has been implemented. While communication between district and unit personnel has reportedly improved in recent time, consistent formal training of master teachers appears to remain a concern.

Respondents on the unit's *Exit Survey of Graduates* rate the support from both university field supervisors and master teachers highly. These ratings are also supported anecdotally. Candidates in both initial and advanced programs report that field supervisors and master teacher/mentors are generally well qualified, readily accessible, and dedicated to their responsibilities to the candidates.

C. Candidates' development and demonstration of knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn.

During the 2006-2007 academic year, the unit placed 381 candidates in Phase 1 of Student Teaching. This total is divided among the following departments:
> Special Education—19
> Elementary—169
> Secondary—191

The unit also placed 37 interns, including 31 in Counseling and six in School Psychology. Candidate performance is assessed in a variety of ways during clinical practice. Teaching Performance Expectations are evaluated by field supervisors through site observations and feedback is provided in both oral and written forms. Candidates also demonstrate their learning and skill development through written assignments, reflections tied to the portfolio, and through the piloting of the Performance Assessment of California Teachers. Field supervisors provide both oral and written feedback following their observations.

Candidates in initial programs are given opportunities to reflect within their portfolios and through conferences with supervisors and master teachers. Candidates in advanced programs are expected to focus their reflections on their efforts to increase student learning, and they demonstrate their learning through culminating experience projects such as action research conducted in their classrooms.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Employers highly rate the performance of the unit's graduates and consider them to be well prepared for the demands of the profession. Candidates express satisfaction in the design of the program and in the support they receive as they learn to implement theory into practice. Coordinators for the most part work well with school personnel in forming practicum placements, and communication is good among the various stakeholders in the process. There is a concern that master (cooperating) teachers are not sufficiently trained for the role of mentor.

NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

Area for Improvement: Orientation and professional development training for master teachers is inconsistent and at times insufficient.

Rationale: Departments within the unit have not completed plans to offer workshops that provide training for master teachers as well as to facilitate communication among master teachers and between master teachers and unit faculty to ensure a more consistent approach to the coaching of candidates.

State Team Decision: Standard Met with Concerns
Field Experience is inconsistent across the programs. Training of master teachers and field supervisors varies depending on the program. There is no evidence of a systematic approach to training, orientation and assessment of field experiences.

STANDARD 4. Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools.

The unit is firmly rooted in an appreciation of diversity and the right of equitable treatment. The collective vision of the faculty in the unit, the P-12 community, and school partners is to prepare educators broad-based, in-depth content and pedagogical knowledge and experience in a varied community settings that enable candidates to develop and strengthen the knowledge, skills, and dispositions meet the diverse needs of all learners.

A.   Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

The unit's conceptual framework provides the foundation for a commitment to diversity. Consistent with the principle—*Preparing reflective and innovative professionals as leaders to ensure the educational development of diverse populations within dynamic education contexts*— an appreciation of diversity and the right of equitable treatment are common threads infused in the curriculum of the unit. Candidates completing both initial and advanced programs are required to meet specific diversity requirements, including the California TPEs relating to what candidates should know and be able to do in regard to diverse students and communities they serve, through individual course requirements and field experiences.

Candidates are provided opportunities to apply knowledge and skills through various levels of field experience and clinical practice. Placement of candidates is within school systems that have diverse populations of students, faculty, and staff. Field experiences also enable candidates to learn from the diverse students and communities in which they are placed. Candidates are required to reflect on their experiences in courses and seminars that accompany student teaching. Assessment portfolios and field experience evaluations require candidates to address the needs of diverse students with explicit requirements for special needs and English language learners.

Candidates are rated satisfactory by employers, master teachers, and program faculty in their ability to incorporate diversity into their practice and establish a classroom climate that values diversity.   Visits to field placement sites and interviews with stakeholders verified the satisfaction. The strongest area of support for this finding is evidenced by the California State University Systemwide Survey on the effectiveness of unit-prepared teachers to support equity and diversity and to teach English language learners. The data suggest that over time, there is strong consensus that teachers and their employers judge preparation to have been strong in this area. The Unit does acknowledge a downward trend in these figures, but evidence was provided indicating program level plans to strengthen the curriculum.

SFSU-Prepared Teachers and Employers Assess Preparation for Diversity and Teaching English Language Learners

Year	Equity & Diversity (K-12) (Well Prepared or Adequately Prepared)	English Language Learners (K-12) (Well Prepared or Adequately Prepared)
01-02	85%	84%
02-03	84%	85%
03-04	81%	82%
04-05	75%	78%
NOTE: Source—CSU Teacher Education Survey. Respondents selected from four response choices: "Well Prepared," "Adequately Prepared," "Somewhat Prepared," and "Not-at-All Prepared." A panel of CSU Deans determined that rankings at the first two levels comprised successful target goals. The percentage scores above report the sum of these two target rankings. Furthermore, the Deans determined that a score of 75% or more was the desired composite percentage target.		

Candidates are evaluated at the course level and all programs have at their core the development of candidates that are able to affect the diverse students, clients, and communities they serve. Programs within the unit address the diverse nature of schools, communities, and institutions. Curriculum and clinical experiences related to diversity are integrated throughout all programs.

B.   Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

Candidates in the Unit regularly interact in classroom settings and in schools with professional education faculty, faculty from other units, and school faculty from diverse ethnic, racial and gender groups. The table below provides data regarding lecturer and tenure/tenure track faculty in professional preparation programs.

Faculty Demographics

	Faculty in Unit Professional Preparation Programs	All Faculty in the Institution (Tenured and Tenure Track)
	N (%)	N (%)
African American	15 (10.87)	43 (5.16)
American Indian	1 (0.72)	7 (0.84)
Asian American	12 (8.7)	134 (16.09)
Filipino	7 (5.07)	12 (1.44)
Mexican American	16 (11.59)	57 (6.84)
Other Non-White	7 (5.07)	27 (3.24)
Pacific Islander	0	1 (0.12)
White	71 (51.45)	552 (66.27)
Hispanic	6 (4.35)	
Decline to State	2 (1.45)	
Unknown	1 (0.72)	
Total	**138**	**833**
Female	70 (50.72)	365 (56.18)
Male	68 (49.28)	468 (43.82)
Tenure/tenure track	(32)	(48.97)
Lecturers	(68)	(50.21)

As evidenced in the 'Diversity Planning in Academic Affairs' a University developed document used to guide hiring decisions, the criteria for hiring new faculty members in the Unit has for the

Table 11
Candidate Demographics Compared to University and Regional Demographics

	Candidates in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs (1)		Candidates in Advanced Preparation Programs (2)		All Students in the Institution (3)		Demographics of Geographical Area Served by Institution (4)
	#	%	#	%	#	%	%
Native American/Alaskan Native	0	0.0%	3	0.3%	194	0.7%	0.3%
Asian, Pacific Islander, Filipino	85	13.5%	192	17.7%	9,544	32.2%	22.3%
Black, Non-Latino	21	3.3%	92	8.5%	1,744	5.9%	6.7%
Latino	55	8.7%	172	15.9%	4,284	14.5%	21.2%
White Non-Latino	338	53.7%	416	38.4%	9,390	31.7%	46.4%
Two or more races	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2.6%
All Other Responses	35	5.6%	64	5.9%	1,449	4.9%	0.5%
Race/Ethnicity Unknown	95	15.1%	143	13.2%	3,023	10.2%	0.0%
Total	629	100.0%	1,082	100.0%	29,628	100.0%	100.0%
Female	431	68.5%	843	77.9%	17,954	60.6%	50.3%
Male	198	31.5%	239	22.1%	11,674	39.4%	49.7%
Total	629	100.0%	1,082	100.0%	29,628	100.0%	100.0%

1) Teaching Credential Only (Single Subject, Multiple Subject, Special Education)
2) Masters and Joint Doctorate Students in the Unit, Masters Degree Candidates in School Psychology, Social Work and Counseling and candidates seeking credentials in Specialist Instruction, Service Credentials, PPS and Clinical Rehab.
3) Includes transitory candidates, i.e.. those admitted under special procedures, but maintain continuing status at another institution.
4) Most recent data for the 9 Bay Area Counties

past decade included the need for knowledge and skill in teaching, counseling or administrative or clinical services in multi-linguistically and ethnically diverse settings. Information regarding recruitment for new faculty is widely disseminated in major publications, and through individual efforts from the dean, department chairs, and recruitment committees to include institutions and agencies most likely to serve diverse populations. This recruitment and hiring practice has resulted in the formation of a culturally and ethnically diverse faculty that reflects the student body and the surrounding community.

C.   Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

The rich multicultural and multilingual demographics of California provide unique opportunities for candidates. Candidates in all programs are diverse and opportunities for candidates to work with other candidates who have exceptionalities and are from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, language, socioeconomic, and religious groups are readily available. The fall 2006 enrollment data presented in the following table provides evidence to support the diversity of candidates compared with the population of the nine Bay Area Counties served by the unit.

D.   Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P–12 Schools

Opportunities for candidates to work with diverse students in P-12 schools begin with 45 hours of early field experience in the initial programs. The 45 hours of observation are required to be completed in a P-12 school with students that are from a different ethnic or cultural background than that of the candidate.

Indicators of various course evaluation and clinical placement evaluation rubrics measure candidates' abilities to interact with students of diverse populations. Faculty, supervising teachers, and master teachers rate candidates periodically on these indicators. Interviews with program faculty, candidates, and other stakeholders support the acquisition of these abilities.

Overall Assessment of Standard:

Diversity is a strength of the unit and provides the foundation of all programs. San Francisco State University is known for its appreciation of diversity and the right of equitable treatment. These affirmations are common threads infused in the curriculum of the Unit. Ample survey and anecdotal evidence was available to verify that the unit has strength in this area. However, as supported by the findings cited in Standard 2, limited results of assessments relating to the evaluation of diversity standards were available to the visiting team.

NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

Area for Improvement: None

State Team Decision: Standard Met

STANDARD 5: Faculty Performance and Development

> *Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.*

Level: Initial and Advanced

A.   Qualified faculty

Education programs in the unit are primarily offered at the graduate level, with both initial and advanced credentials, masters degree programs; and joint doctoral programs offered in collaboration with the University of California. An independent Ed.D. program has been developed and awaiting final WASC approval. The first cohort is expected to enroll in fall 2007.

A review of the vitae on file as well as evidence collected via other documents and interviews shows that full-time tenure track faculty in the unit have appropriate terminal degrees, in almost all cases the doctorate (Ph.D. or Ed.D.), and that they have the expertise to deliver all unit programs. Moreover, faculty bring deep experience working with schools to their qualifications, and faculty have records of continuous academic development and scholarly attainment since joining the unit.

Lecturer faculty have at least a master's degree appropriate to the area in which they teach, as well as extensive successful experience in their field of study. Lecturers hired as university field or clinical supervisors must have the same qualifications as all other temporary faculty. Master teachers are vetted by each department to ensure that they have credentials appropriate to their teaching assignments and that they have the experience necessary to mentor and supervise candidates. Department chairs select lecturer personnel from a qualified pool of candidates.

The unit's reputation for excellence in teacher education and clinical experiences in the community, as verified by interviews with employers and community members, provides SFSU with a strong pool of interested applicants for temporary teaching assignments. The unit draws qualified applicants from the pool of graduates of Bay Area institutions such as the University of California, Berkeley, Stanford University, and the Joint Doctoral Program in Special Education with UC Berkeley. All faculty members, in tenure-track and temporary positions, have had prior direct experience in schools, classrooms, administrative, and/or clinical settings. Additionally, all recent hires have had experience in multicultural or multilingual settings and with candidates who have exceptionalities.

Table 14 from the Institutional Report shows the distribution of Tenure/Tenure Track and Lecturer Faculty within the Unit.

Table 14
Academic Rank of Professional Education Faculty For Academic Year 2006

Academic Rank	No. of Faculty with Tenure	Non-tenured Faculty	
		On Tenure Track	Not on Tenure Track
Professors	32		
Associate Professors	14		
Assistant Professors	1	17	
Instructors			
Lecturers			136
Graduate Teaching Assistants			
Other			
Total	**47**	**17**	136

Faculty members are fully involved with field or clinical experiences as a necessary and vital part of programs. Field supervisors are chosen through a collaborative effort with administrators in the districts and agencies, and formal agreements are made to provide training sites and field supervisors

Department chairs and faculty actively recruit qualified professionals to supervise candidates' field experiences. Each specialist program area compiles a list of qualified district field supervisors. Field supervisors are then selected on the basis of their qualifications, experience, and interest in supervising candidates. The faculty and department chairs seek field supervisors who have appropriate state certification, academic preparation, and successful experience in the credential area where their services are requested. Once they are selected, supervisors undergo orientation and training sessions conducted by the student teaching placement coordinator or department chairperson.

B. Modeling best professional practices in teaching

The unit's conceptual framework highlights the commitment to the development of reflective practitioners and a focus on diversity. The unit mission and Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) policies highlight quality teaching as a first consideration. The University Faculty Manual expresses the expectation that a faculty member will "maintain a scholarly level of instruction, show commitment to high academic and pedagogic standards, be effective in instructing and advising students, guide and motivate students, and apply evaluative standards fairly and appropriately with respect to all students. "

In the unit the framework and university expectations for teaching are met and corroborated in the record of teaching evaluations on file. The research and experiences of faculty in working with diverse ethnic, racial, gender, language, religious, disability, and sexual identities are reflected in their teaching, as is evident by a review of syllabi along with interviews with all constituent groups. This focus on diversity ensures that all faculty members in the unit provide effective instruction to prepare their candidates to teach in an increasingly diverse, urban community context. The Unit's vision, that of "preparing reflective and innovative professionals as leaders to ensure the educational development of diverse populations within dynamic educational contexts," reflects the unit's intent to prepare teachers to work effectively in diverse communities. In an environment that values such diversity, faculty involved with the preparation of teachers, administrators, counselors, or clinicians use a variety of teaching strategies and materials. These include technology, hybrid on-line options, student-centered classrooms,

project-based learning, case studies, field experiences, etc. Faculty model and teach a variety of assessment strategies, both traditional and electronic or web-based, including multiple methods of formative and summative testing, qualitative and quantitative approaches, authentic and performance assessments.

Unit faculty are fully engaged in modeling the behaviors of reflective practitioners and educational leaders in their teaching. Courses are frequently revised to reflect current theoretical and practical knowledge of the profession, as course syllabi and minutes of faculty meetings reveal. All are involved in collaborative activities with school districts and many provide professional development for other faculty members. Many faculty are educational leaders in their respective areas and serve as officers in regional and national educational organizations. Others are active in helping to set standards in state and professional organizations. Testimonials from current students and graduates generally praise the quality of teaching among unit faculty. Most faculty incorporate a variety of teaching strategies and approaches. Faculty vitae document the accomplishments and dedication that lead to excellence in teaching, and to modeling best professional practices.

SFSU faculty have also been actively engaged in integrating technology into their own classroom practice. They model how various technologies can be used to enhance teaching and learning. Faculty members in the ITEC department spearheaded a federally-funded PT3 initiative, which successfully supported faculty to integrate technology into their teaching as well as to collaborate with local teachers and school districts. Most faculty now use varying forms of technology in their classroom practice, and learning management systems such as iLearn and Blackboard are routinely used, as course syllabi show. Candidates are also expected to integrate technology, and in meetings with school district personnel, employers praised the ability of graduates to incorporate technology into their teaching or administrative work. Faculty encourage candidates to use International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) standards and resources for integrating technology in their classes.

C.   Modeling best professional practices in scholarship

In spite of heavy teaching loads, unit faculty remain current in their discipline through study, research, and/or through consultation and collaboration with public school groups on research or grant projects, or other consultation with schools on research, theory development, or other practical application activities. Attendance and participation at professional conferences is also encouraged. Faculty vitae indicate that most faculty members are actively engaged in research and publication. Faculty members have experience in their fields through past employment in public schools, previous assignments in institutions of higher education, on-going research, publications and other activities. Many are regional and state leaders in their fields and several have national and international leadership positions. While lecturers have primarily teaching responsibilities, many are also actively engaged in one or more of the above professional development activities.

Unit expectations point to multiple ways for faculty to model best professional practices in scholarship and faculty vitae mirror this. Many faculty are active in publishing books, book chapters, and journal articles, as well as in making presentations at professional conferences. Many are nationally—and internationally—known for their research and scholarship. Others are committed to and particularly active in curricular innovation, as is evidenced in the growing masters degree program in Equity and Social Justice, developing programs and connections with

China, and the new doctorate in Educational Leadership. Faculty vitae are replete with examples of work that demonstrate scholarly activity in teaching, learning, and other fields of the unit's faculty specializations.

D. Modeling best professional practices in service

Faculty in the unit are involved in a multitude of service activities to both the community and campus. In interviews faculty acknowledged that they understand that as part of preparing leaders for dynamic educational contexts, they must themselves lead by example. Many faculty serve on various boards locally, statewide, nationally and internationally. Some are activists in their communities. As part of a University that is committed to community engagement, unit faculty are actively engaged in community service that is connected to local, national, and international interests. Faculty serve actively on department and college personnel, curriculum and governance committees. These activities are evidenced in faculty vitae, and verified through interviews with faculty and administrators.

E.   Collaboration

Collaboration is critical to the work and commitment of SFSU faculty, as meeting minutes and constituent interviews confirm, and collaboration is a characteristic of each program and department, and the unit as a whole. Standing committees within the unit, as well as ad hoc task forces work to promote discussion and collaborative decisions regarding program and unit improvement. By way of example, discussions between faculty and school partners happen routinely regarding the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that candidates should acquire and demonstrate. In addition several faculty have joint appointments in other colleges, which leads to opportunities that further facilitate collaborations among colleges and programs, for example in the delivery of the MA in Math Education; and the development of the new Ed.D. was led by Education and Arts, Sciences and Business faculty working in collaboration.

Faculty are engaged in collaborative efforts across disciplines, departments, colleges other universities, and multiple school districts. They are engaged in projects and programs that are designed to recruit teachers, especially those in underrepresented groups and areas.

Furthermore, the unit collaborates with local school districts to ensure that all internship candidates receive appropriate information and advisement needed to enter into and matriculate through the multiple or single subject teacher preparation, the educational specialists, and pupil personnel services programs. The Dean's office also collaborates with school districts and faculty in all credential program areas to develop appropriate plans. Memoranda of Understanding are developed with all districts in which internships are in place between the unit and local school districts. These documents serve as evidence of the strong collaborations that are maintained between the unit and numerous local educational agencies.

F.   Unit evaluation of professional education faculty performance

Excellence in teaching is one of the most important tasks of a faculty member, and demonstrated teaching excellence is required to obtain retention, tenure, and promotion. Instructional performance is the first area assessed during the personnel evaluation process. To promote teaching excellence, the unit ensures that members of the faculty are encouraged to use effective teaching strategies and techniques by reviewing candidate evaluations and peer observations of

faculty instruction in class. New tenure-track and temporary faculty are also provided with examples of materials and course syllabi to aid in their development of effective instructional practices. Field supervisors meet with faculty coordinators for orientations when they are hired, and they are provided with handbooks to guide their work with candidates in the field.

At the end of each semester, candidates evaluate the teaching of tenure/tenure track and temporary faculty in each course taught in the unit. In Academic Year 2004-2005, the SFSU Academic Senate for the first time adopted a common course evaluation format for University-wide use, and each College in turn revised its evaluation forms accordingly. One standard form is now used to evaluate common core items for faculty teaching and supervision effectiveness.

The course evaluation ratings of candidates provide the major evidence regarding teaching success for all faculty members. A review of evaluations collected over the most recent semesters reveal an overall high rating of faculty by students. Department chairs review the evaluations and meet with faculty members whose ratings show need for improvement and help the faculty member develop an improvement plan. The plan often includes meeting with senior faculty members as mentors, and/or visiting classes and consulting with their colleagues on ways to improve their quality of instruction. Any faculty member can request a classroom observation at any time from another faculty member and/or the Director of the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching. Temporary faculty members are retained only as long as they maintain satisfactory performance in their teaching.

The unit's Exit Survey is also used to evaluate professional education faculty performance. As an example, The Survey Report for Academic Year 2003-04 found that "Overall, graduates are satisfied with the quality of the faculty and instruction in program coursework, and that these ratings are consistent across the three years in which data were collected…. mean responses were consistently the highest for items such as "Instructors encouraged student participation" (4.52). See table 15 from the Institutional Report below.

Table 15
Quality of Faculty and Instruction in Program Coursework—All Programs
(n=536)

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
Instructors had command of the subject	4.36	0.74
Classes were well-organized	3.96	0.86
Courses contributed significantly to my knowledge	4.13	0.88
Instructors' assessment procedures were relevant to course content	4.19	0.76
Instructors encouraged student participation	4.52	0.67
Instructors showed respect for students with different points of view	4.36	0.80
Overall, the teaching of instructors was effective	4.18	0.79
(NOTE: Responses were made on a 5-level Likert-type scale, with "5" signifying "Strongly Agree" and "1" signifying Strongly Disagree.)		

G. Unit facilitation of professional development

Continuous professional growth of faculty is expected at SFSU, and resources have been provided for faculty as part of this commitment. Support for faculty travel to present at conferences is provided, and funding to assist faculty to develop courses that emphasize diversity in learning is also available through university mini-grants.

The California State University System provides for the following means:
- Summer stipends equivalent to one to two months salary
- Sabbatical leaves for research, scholarship, and creative activity at full pay for one semester of differences-in-pay for more than one semester
- Fulbright Exchange Program Scholarships
- Fee waiver programs for full-time faculty and staff to enroll in University courses
- Fees and expenses for yearly summer institutes to provide CSU professors a forum to share effective teaching practices
- A yearly Symposium on University Teaching hosted by a CSU campus provides a forum for CSU faculty to present their latest instructional developments.

On the SFSU campus, the Center for Teaching and Faculty Development (CFTD) promotes and supports teaching excellence in an atmosphere of collegiality. CFTD organizes workshops and other activities to assist faculty to develop: (1) alternative teaching strategies; (2) multicultural perspectives in instruction; (3) instructional uses of technologies, including electronic communication, multimedia, presentation graphics, and discipline-specific software; (4) classroom assessment techniques; and (5) strategies for advancing research and scholarly activities. An Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs was created in fall 2005 and was hired in 2006 and is now responsible for coordinating the activities offered through the CFTD. CTFD also offers support to faculty and opportunities for professional growth through: (1) a New Faculty Orientation; (2) a meeting for mentors and new faculty mantes; and (3) confidential work with the faculty member to help improve instruction.

In addition to providing support for teaching, the CFTD established several "Collaboratories" which are housed in various spaces throughout the campus. One of these Collaboratories is housed in Burk Hall, where the Unit is located. A Collaboratory offers an innovative and exciting environment for instruction where, through the use of interactive software, groups of individuals can discuss and resolve complex issues by inputting information into a software package capable of compiling the information for group discussion. The setting also recognizes ideas equally, and faculty members are encouraged to use the Collaboratory to assist them in curriculum delivery.

Other sources of professional development support for faculty include the following:

- **Academic Computing** offers faculty development in specific areas of computer access and use. Courses in word processing, use of spreadsheets and databases, and electronic mail and other networking skills are presented, sometimes in conjunction with CFTD.

- The **Office of Research and Sponsored Programs** (ORSP) supports faculty development by providing assistance in the development of grants and contracts. Staff members are available to assist with grant writing, budget development, and in the fiscal

implementation of grant awards. Regular notices of funding opportunities are also sent out to faculty.

- The **Office of Faculty Affairs and Professional Development** sponsors course, seminar, and colloquium offerings and grant opportunities in professional development. These offerings are generally announced at the beginning of each semester and cover such issues as working with diverse learners, managing conflict in the classroom, and exploring the political/social climate of higher education.

- Through the **Center for Teaching and Faculty Development** (CTFD), the University provides faculty with mini-grants for additional funding support, graduate assistants, and time off to work on their curriculum, as well as conduct research in their areas of study that will help candidates obtain the most recent knowledge and practical experience within their areas of study.

- A University **faculty retreat** is conducted each year by the Academic Senate to focus on a theme that reflects the most current instructional concerns for faculty at SFSU. Visiting speakers and SFSU faculty, staff, and administrators provide sessions addressing issues of concern.

Although a number of services are provided and used by unit faculty within the university, the unit also provides services and resources specifically aimed at addressing the needs of faculty members.

- New faculty members are assigned a senior faculty member to serve as their mentor. It is the responsibility of the tenured faculty member to provide the new faculty member with information about procedures, provide peer coaching when needed, answer questions, and generally provide support for the new colleague.

- Travel funds are made available for faculty for presentations at state and national professional conferences.

- Beginning in AY 2005-06, the Unit Dean was able to secure funds from a private donor to support the establishment of a series of annual Dean's Awards for Research in Education. These mini-grants provide release time on a competitive basis for outstanding faculty members to conduct research projects.

The unit and university provide adequate support for faculty development.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Unit Faculty comprise a talented team of teacher scholars, well prepared in their areas of specialty. Tenure track faculty are highly rated instructors by students and peers, and they are productive in scholarly accomplishment and committed in service to the College, University and the Education professions. Lecturer faculty are carefully selected and evaluated and play key roles in delivering Education programs. School faculty (master teachers and field supervisors) are selected through established criteria and processes serve programs in College-Schools partnerships. The University and the unit evaluate faculty at all levels and offer support in terms of people and financial resources for the faculty's teaching and professional development.

NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met (Initial and Advanced)

Areas for Improvement: None

State Team Decision: Standard Met

STANDARD 6: Unit Governance and Resources

> *The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.*

Level: (Initial and Advanced)

A.   Unit leadership and authority

The Professional Education unit resides primarily in the College of Education. The College of Education is the administrative body that is responsible for teacher education. The Dean of the College is the chief academic officer and is responsible for all academic and administrative operations in the unit.

The Dean is responsible for the areas of curriculum, personnel, budgeting, and the operation governance structure for the unit. The Educational Specialist, Administrative Services, Multiple and Single Subject, Designated Subjects, and Clinical Rehabilitative Services credential programs are housed in the College of Education, while the Pupil Personnel Services-Social Work Program and the Counselor Education Programs are housed in the College of Health and Human Services, and the Pupil Personnel Service-Psychology program is housed in the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences.

The unit head exercises responsibility and authority for the educational unit and all credential programs. For those program areas housed in Colleges outside of the College of Education, the Dean consults with his counterpart Deans in those Colleges as needed. The Head of the Unit reports directly to the Provost and Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs, who reports to the President of the University. The unit head is also responsible for coordinating and approving all CCTC-approved credential programs and credential recommendations. The faculty in the individual departments / programs develop all course work in support of fulfilling the requirements for credentials in their respective programs but within the broad policies established for all programs by the All University Committee for Teacher Education (AUTEC). The unit also has responsibilities for all credentialing programs that are located off campus. These include the Clinical Schools Muir Alternative Teacher Education Program (MATE) at John Muir Elementary School in San Francisco, the Elk Grove Unified School District Teacher Institute in Elk Grove, CA and a multiple subject credential program offered at the Prescott Elementary School (PET) in Oakland.

The unit head is chair of the All University Committee for Teacher Education (AUTEC). This is the policy-making body for credentialing-related concerns. This is a University-wide committee that reports to the Academic Senate. This committee's membership includes the Provost /Vice President for Academic Affairs or designee, Chair or designee from the Liberal Studies Council, Chair or designee from Teacher Credential Committee, Deans or designees from each College, Chair or designee of the Department of Elementary Education, Chair of designee of the Secondary/Post Secondary Education Department, a K-12 (public school) Representative, Teacher Education Student, Academic Senate Representative, Dean of Students or designee, Director of the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching, and a Campus multicultural diversity representative. All terms are for a

period of one year.

The Teacher Credential Committee (TCC) has the responsibility for implementing policies of the All University Teacher Education Committee (AUTEC) that relate to teacher credentialing. This responsibility includes the review and approval of courses and procedures proposed by Departments and Colleges to meet AUTEC guidelines for: early field experience units, certification of subject matter competency, joint supervision of candidates for teaching credentials, multicultural knowledge and skills, recruitment of racial and ethnic minority students into teaching credential programs and implementation of computer literacy requirements. Membership of the TCC includes a representative from each College, a representative from the Liberal Studies Council, a representative from the Credential Analyst Office, a representative from the K-12 Public School area, a representative from each of the following Teacher Education Departments: Elementary Education, Secondary/Post Secondary Education, Special Education, Administration and Interdisciplinary Studies. Membership also includes a student representative from the following Teacher Education Departments: Elementary Education and Secondary Education. The Associate Dean of the College of Education has a position on the TCC.

The degree of autonomy afforded programs and departments within the current structure of the unit contribute to unevenness across programs in areas such as the collection and use of assessment data on candidate performance.

Advisement is addressed in policy at the University level. It states that at a minimum, advising revolves around the following five key pivotal points: (1) when the student enters the university, either as a first-year or transfer student, (2) when the student enters the major, minor, or program, (3) if and when the student experiences academic difficulty, including probation and possibility of disqualification, (4) when the student moves into upper division standing and closer to graduation and (5) as the student prepares to graduate and move beyond his or her studies at the University.

Advisement is provided to students in multiple ways to meet their particular needs.
The Unit's Credential Services Teacher Preparation Center (CSTPC) provides information and advice about application documents that candidates need to prepare in order to be admitted into credential programs.

Faculty advisement is provided in individual or group settings and is based on the candidate's unique needs and goals. Each faculty member in the unit must schedule a minimum of four hours per week of office hours and must be available for student advisement during that time. Department Offices provide candidates with on-going changes and developments made concerning teaching content standards and curriculum. Once students are admitted to graduate study, all procedures related to progression through the program, including admission to candidacy, proposal for culminating experience, IRB review, and report of completion of culminating experience are supported through the graduate office.

Information about the academic unit is available through the following: The university Bulletin informs candidates about admissions requirements into the university and to credential and degree programs. The bulletin is revised annually. The university and unit's

websites provide information about course offerings, schedules, fees and other information necessary for enrollment. This information is updated as needed. The Credential Bulletin provides specific information about each credential program offered at the University, including required courses and other requirements that must be met to be eligible for a California credential. Other options to support student include the University Career Counseling and Development Center, The University Financial Aid Office, The Testing Center, a Peer Counseling Program and the Disability Resource Center

B. Unit Budget

The Provost distributes the funds to each college dean based upon the previous year's allocations, with adjustments for growth or other fiscal conditions. The unit head (COE dean) has the discretion to allocate personnel and operating funds to departments.

The College of Education operating budget totaled approximately $6.15 million in 2006-2007. Of that total, $6.05 million was expended on personnel and $235,000 on operations during the fiscal year. This is over a 13% decrease from a budget of $7.134 million in the budget year of 2003-2004. This reduction was inline with a decease in the student FTE from 1762 in 2003-2004 to 1064 in 2006 -2007. Funding for travel by field supervisors was included in the 2005 – 2006 budget at $15,000. That amount was dropped from the 2006 – 2007 budget. Master teachers who supervised candidates during their field experiences are supported by $140,000 in budget for stipends.

The unit's budget compares favorably to the budgets of other colleges and schools on the campus. A 2006 -2007 faculty salary peer comparison report shows that faculty salaries in the unit are compatible with salaries of faculty outside of the unit, often exceeding the salaries for faculty who traditionally far out pace the salary of College of Education faculty. The comparison report also showed that COE faculty at SFSU surpassed the average salary for comparable faculty rank for the university.

The funding for professional development for the faculty is supported by an allocation of $15,000 in the general budget for faculty travel. However, there are grant opportunities that support professional development. Active grants secured since 2003 have a value of $3.28 million. Beginning in AY 2005-06, the unit's dean secured funds from a private donor to support the establishment of a series of annual Dean's Awards for Research in Education. These mini-grants provide release time on a competitive basis for outstanding faculty members to conduct research projects.

C. Personnel

Each full-time faculty member is assigned a full-time workload of 15 weighted teaching units (WTUs), which is comprised of 12 units (semester credits) for instruction or field supervision (generally three courses of three units each), and three units for advisement, committee work, and other assignments as approved by the department Chair and Dean. There is no differentiation being made in the workload formula for graduate and undergraduate faculty. Field supervision is assigned on a ratio of one unit per every three graduate candidates supervised. This is a heavy university-level teaching load. The field supervision workload ratio and increases overall faculty workload reducing time allocations for research and professional development.

The Faculty Contract (Memorandum of Understanding) between the CSU and the faculty bargaining unit does allow faculty latitude in negotiating workload assignments within their departments, as long as the Unit's targets are met. Faculty can secure release time for research, scholarship, program development, and grant-related activities.

There are several key staff support structures in the Unit that enable the accomplishment of the unit's mission. These include the Credential Services Teacher Preparation Center (CSTPC), the Cahill Learning Resources and Media Laboratory, the Graduate Office, and the Providers of Educational Technology Services (POETS). At the department level, staff support is primarily provided by Administrative Office Coordinators (AOCs).

D.   Unit facilities

The unit is located in Burk Hall. In 1997 the building underwent significant reconstruction and was expanded in order to provide additional office and classroom and laboratory space to house credential and degree programs. Most instructional activities take place in classrooms and laboratories in Burk Hall. A Clinics Complex was added and supports the Communicative Disorders Program and some aspects of the Counseling and Nursing programs. The Cahill Learning Resources and Media Laboratory was expanded, and now houses more teaching materials and related resources for teacher candidates and other teachers within the community. The Teacher Preparation Center (TPC) was established in the fall, 2001 to provide a "one-stop shopping" center for candidates interested in teaching as a career. And in the fall 2004 this office was combined with the Credential Services Office and they now jointly comprise the Credential Teacher Preparation Center (CSTPC).

Full-time faculty members are assigned permanent office space. Every faculty member has a telephone with voicemail; a computer linked to the campus server with access to e-mail, the Internet, and many on-line databases and library services. Part-time faculty share office space, and they are also provided with telephones, computer access, and voicemail.

E.   Unit resources including technology

The technology resources in the unit are extensive, and they represent a substantial development effort to place the unit on the cutting edge in computer technology and applications in education. Two computer classrooms located in Burk Hall 218 and 219, and there is an extensive computer laboratory in Burk Hall 214.

The Cahill Learning Resources and Media Laboratory has several computer work stations, obtained as part of a grant from Apple Computing, Inc. In addition, the Cahill Laboratory has video production and post-production equipment, a variety of curricular texts and references, and a variety of assessment tests.

All unit classrooms are equipped with a mounted monitor connected to the cable system from the Audio-Visual Center on campus, as well as a video/DVD player. Additional AV equipment for teaching is available through either the Cahill Laboratory or the University's Audiovisual and Media Laboratory. Additionally, both offices provide multimedia carts

that support the use of multimedia in the classrooms. Teleconferencing and video conferencing facilities are available by arrangement with the campus Audio-Visual Center to support classroom instruction.

The J. Paul Leonard Library serves candidates and faculty with a substantial collection of over 1,482,000 volumes, 9,356 periodicals subscriptions, 140 database subscriptions and 187 computer terminals with public access to on-line databases and sources of information. The library is open 81 hours a week, with computer labs and extended study spaces open for additional hours when classes are in session.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The governance structure gives the unit the authority for operation and decision-making responsibilities for the teacher and other school personnel preparation programs at the initial and advanced levels. There is a lack of continuity across the programs and departments in the unit. The funding, and resources are adequate to support the program. The availability and use of technology to support and deliver the preparation programs is sufficient. The field supervision workload ratio is high and impacts the time available for scholarship and service.

NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

Areas for Improvement:

New: There is a lack of coherence in the unit governance structure.

Rationale: Programs operate as independent entities with little coordination, integration and coherence across the unit.

New: Faculty workloads are excessive.

Rationale: Faculty with field supervision assignments have workloads that impact research and scholarship.

State Team Decision: Standard Met with Concerns

Resources are inadequate given the number and complexity of programs in the unit, specifically coordinators need release time, particularly for the large programs. Furthermore, supervision of three student teachers per credit is too heavy a load, particularly for junior tenure track faculty.

Evidence reviewed indicates that inadequate resources are provided to the unit to implement the number and complexity of programs currently in operation. Evidence indicates that faculty, especially junior tenure track faculty, must devote an inordinate amount of time to supervision.

Internship Issues for State Report:

Common Standards 1 and 2 – Leadership and Resources
The San Francisco State University College of Education has an official agreement with each school district in which an intern is employed. Each district provides each intern with a support provider, and when needed, additional resources.

Common Standard 4 – Evaluation
Intern programs fall under the same structure of oversight as do the traditional tracks. Chairs of departments and coordinators along with the credential office staff monitor the programs. The advisory committees utilized by the traditional programs also serve intern programs.

Common Standard 5 – Admission
Admission of intern candidates is coordinated by credential staff and the appropriate intern coordinator or department chair. Those candidates who have been admitted to traditional tracks may apply for internship through the credentials office and the program coordinator or department chair. The credential office assures that all intern credential requirements are met.

Common Standard 6 – Advice and Assistance
In most programs, interns follow the same program as traditional students. They have access to the same program information and assistance as any students, including websites, handbooks, the credentials office, faculty advisors, and coordinators/chairs. School sites also provide credential assistance to these candidates.

Common Standard 7 – School Collaboration
Coordinators appear to have very close collaborative relationships with districts in which candidates are placed. School sites are frequently visited and principals have excellent knowledge of their SFSU interns. Advisory groups include site teachers who support interns.

Common Standard 8 – District Field Supervisors
Districts appear to have responsibility for providing field site support for SFSU interns, although the university provides the same level of university supervisor support for these teachers.

PROGRAM STANDARDS

Multiple Subject Credential
Multiple Subject Internship Credential
Multiple Subject BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish and Cantonese) Credential

Findings on Standards
After the review of the university report, supporting documentation, and the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, employers, and faculty, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Multiple Subject Program - BCLAD with Spanish and Cantonese Emphases. All program standards for the Multiple Subject Credential and Multiple Subject Internship Credential are met with the following exceptions:

Standard Met with Concerns
Standard 15: Learning to Teach Through Supervised Fieldwork
Multiple Subject candidates are not all placed in two different grade span placements. Many candidates remain in the same class for the entire year, and do not do additional field work in a second grade span.

Multiple Subject Credential only: Standard Met with Concerns
Standard 16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors
Interviews with supervising practitioners in the on-campus program indicated that orientation and training are not consistently implemented.   Although, university field supervisors indicated that they provide a folder of information and scheduled meetings at each school with student teachers and their supervising practitioners to review requirements, the team did not find evidence of the meetings.

Strengths
Cantonese and Spanish BCLAD students are provided with training that fully prepares these students to meet the demands of English language learners (ELL) in bilingual settings. For the Multiple Subject program and the Multiple Subject BCLAD programs (Spanish and Cantonese), the design and implementation of the admissions process gives the faculty excellent information about potential candidates. The process includes a writing activity that allows candidates an opportunity to draw on their previous field experience to respond to a scenario based on a classroom situation. Faculty assess preliminary knowledge, skills, and, dispositions that the candidate would bring into the program uses the information. Tests of language proficiency in the target languages are given to students at any point in the program to ensure that the candidate has the language proficiencies needed to teach in English and other target languages.

The emphasis on producing reflective practitioners is evident throughout the both program. Candidates have multiple opportunities to reflect on their practice during classes and as part of their field experiences and student teaching, and they realize the importance of this reflection. In commenting on these many opportunities, one student stated that, "It helps me to become reflective—which, I think, is the goal of the program."

Program requirements are parallel for the Multiple Subject Credential throughout the onsite program, the intern program, the Elk Grove satellite program, the intern program and the Bay

Area Teacher Training Institute (BATTI) program for private school teachers and paraprofessionals. Master Teachers and employers of graduates praised the preparation of student teachers and graduates, noting especially their ability to take the initiative in the classroom.

Concerns
No additional concerns.

Single Subject Credential Program
Single Subject Credential Internship Program

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Single Subject Programs except for Standard 16.

Standard Not Met
Standard 16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors
Although there is evidence that a student teaching handbook is available and given to master teachers, and site administrators, as well as internship site supervisors, there is no evidence of opportunities for parties involved to "complete training in teacher development."

Strengths

The teacher candidates reported that faculty is energetic and innovative in their teaching craft as well as knowledgeable in their content areas. They also believe that the nature of the program is progressive and that the content is global.

The collaboration between SFSU and the Elk Grove Unified School District is to be commended. All parties involved spoke to the highly qualified teacher candidates, the adjunct faculty and the faculty from SFSU's main campus.

The collaboration between several school districts in the area provide ample opportunities for teacher candidates to apply learned skills at SFSU in their subject areas.

The teacher candidates spoke highly of the diversity of the Single Subject faculty and the theme of diversity that is woven throughout all of the program courses and for the most part their field sites.

The iCap portfolio is an effective manner of collecting data that has informed teacher candidate performance as well as course modification.

The teacher candidates spoke highly of the qualifications of their Master Teachers and the feedback they receive throughout their student teaching experience. They felt that their Master Teachers were flexible, understanding, and provided support as they student taught and took courses at SFSU. Teacher candidates appreciated the fact that they were able to submit three possible placement sites as to where to student teach and for the most part their first or second choice was honored.

The various advisory Single Subject committees (Credential Advisory Committee, Student Teaching Council) support the overall program design and oversight as a tool to make program recommendations.

Support for the secondary faculty is evident in the full-time position of a field placement coordinator in place of a tenure line position. The Single Subject Internship Program parallels the regular Single Subjects credential program therefore the teacher candidates are receiving the same learning opportunities both in quality of theory and practice.

Concerns:
No additional concerns

Reading Certificate
Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential

Findings on Standards
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, and faculty, the team determined that all program standards, except for Standard 7 and Standard 16, are met for the Reading Certificate and Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Programs.

Standards Not Met
Standard 7: Application and Reinforcement Through Field Experiences
Standard 16: Advanced Clinical Experiences
Currently, there is no field placement component in the Reading Certificate Program and there is no advanced clinical experience in the Reading Specialist Credential Program. Faculty cite financial constraints as a factor. Although there is no formal field placement or advanced clinical experience, in EED 770 and EED 771, candidates administer assessments to students and make recommendations for interventions. However, there is no requirement to plan and implement lessons in the field, nor do candidates conduct interventions with struggling readers. EED 770 and EED 771 are heavily research-based, with no clinical intervention as a follow through to the assigned assessments.

Strengths
The core values guiding the Reading Certificate and Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Programs are reflected in the course work and speak to the program's record of successful preparation of candidates. Faculty in the School of Education's Reading Certificate and Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Programs provide a challenging and supportive environment in which candidates are encouraged to adhere to high academic standards and professional conduct. Course syllabi, faculty modeling, and relevant activities facilitate student engagement with the curriculum.

Students are required to conduct detailed assessment assignments, write extensively (particularly analyses of research), present frequently in front of peers, and complete leadership project portfolios. Students report that they are given immediate feedback on their assignments; faculty monitor progress and provide a continual stream of assistance in helping students improve their pedagogical skills. Candidates meet once per semester with the Program Coordinator and are encouraged to meet more often, if needed.

All candidates and graduates interviewed cite the strength of the program in making the translation from theory into evidence-based practice. Significant attention is given to supporting English language learners and to issues of diversity and equity throughout the program. Candidates experience a very high level of confidence in their improved ability to teach reading, particularly comprehension, and to address the needs of struggling readers.

Concerns
No additional concerns.

Designated Subjects
Vocational Education Teaching Credentials
Adult Education Teaching Credentials

Findings on Standards
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Designated Subjects Adult Education Teaching Program; similarly, the team determines that standards are met for the Designated Subjects Vocational Education Teaching Credential Program, with the exception of Standard 12: Classroom and Laboratory Management and Standard 14: Teaching Students with Special Needs. These standards are met with concerns.

Standard Met with Concerns
Designated Subjects Vocational Education Teaching Credential—Standard 12, Classroom and Laboratory Management: While interviews indicate that tenured and tenure-line faculty have the expertise and flexibility to meet the specific needs of Designated Subjects Vocational Education teacher candidates with regard to Laboratory Management (as opposed to Classroom Management), the team did not find evidence that the program has a systematic process that ensures these students access to this credential-specific standard. Specifically, program documents, e.g., syllabi, observations protocols, do not include Laboratory Management.

Designated Subjects Vocational Education Teaching Credential—Standard 14, Teaching Students with Special Needs: While interviews indicate that tenured and tenure-line faculty have the expertise and flexibility to meet the specific needs of Designated Subjects Vocational Education teacher candidates, the team did not find evidence that the program has a systematic process that ensures students access to this credential-specific standard. Specifically, program documents, e.g., syllabi, observations protocols, do not explicitly address instruction for "handicapped students in vocational programs" and the "legal basis for the provision of education for … the handicapped and relate it to their own program."

Strengths
The faculty of the Center for Adult Education, a unit of the Department of Administration & Interdisciplinary Studies in the College of Education, encourages students to adhere to high standards of professional conduct through course syllabi, classroom activities and personal models. Knowledgeable tenured and tenure-line faculty, pre-service classroom observations and school-site interviews and in-class discussion allow students in a very diverse credential program access to subject matter specific andragogy and pedagogy in each of the academic, non-academic

and vocational credential areas. Students build a sense of community through classroom presentations, sample lessons, and discussion of peer comment.

The Designated Subjects Vocational and Adult Education Teaching Credential programs have clear processes for preparing candidates for the credential. Candidates meet with trained faculty, as well as a credential analyst, to understand the prerequisites and required documentation in preparation for their clear credential. Through selected literature and course discussion (small and large group), students critically examine and reflect upon the implications of multiple theories of learning which inform practice. Particular emphasis is given to those theorists who provide an understanding of age, culture, language, gender and ethnicity. Students are given timely feedback on their progress and assistance in improving their andragogical skills.

Through coursework and field experience, candidates demonstrate professional educational competency. Coursework includes a series of individually assessed task assignments, which assure that candidates comply with credential requirements. In field experience, supervisors make use of a field-based classroom observation tool to analyze, document, and provide feedback on candidate classroom performance as a part of their supervised field experience. The core values guiding the teacher preparation program are reflected in the coursework and field experiences.

The Designated Subjects Adult Education and Vocational Education Teaching Credential Program at San Francisco State University marries substantial intellectual rigor and academic merit with practical, real-world field experience.

San Francisco State University graduates of and candidates in the Designated Subjects Teaching Credential programs consistently felt confident and well-prepared to respond to their teaching assignments. Additionally, many choose to enter the San Francisco State University Master of Arts in Education with Concentrations in Vocational Education, a degree option which is designed for graduate candidates who wish to pursue advanced studies on workforce learning and educational processes.

Candidates, graduates, faculty and local school district personnel reflect enthusiasm and praise of San Francisco State University credential program. In addition to employment in P14 settings, Program graduates work as leaders in a wide variety of contexts addressing the increasing need for adult education activities in literacy programs, community colleges, the workplace, and community-based organizations.

Concerns
While interviews indicate that tenured and tenure-line faculty have the expertise and flexibility to meet the specific needs of Designated Subjects Vocational Education teacher candidates with regard pedagogy (as opposed to andragogy), it is not clear that adjunct and non-tenure track faculty members maintain the same high quality of instruction for Designated Subjects Vocational Education teacher candidates.

<div align="center">

Adapted Physical Education

</div>

Findings on Standards
The Adapted Physical Education credential program at San Francisco University is to be

commended on its faculty, coursework, and advisement of students. Based on candidate, faculty, and employer interviews, document review, site visits, and interviews with graduates of the Adapted Physical Education Program, the team determines that all standards are fully met.

Strengths
The program faculty is commended for their strong dedication to students and the profession. Faculty guidance and mentorship of each individual student in the program is extensive and supportive.

Concerns
None

Education Specialist Credential Program
Mild/Moderate Level I and Level II

Findings on Standards
The Level 1 Education Specialist Credential Program in Mild/Moderate Disabilities at San Francisco University is to be commended on its faculty and their initiative in innovative programs and grant projects. Based on candidate, faculty, and employer interviews, document review, site visits, and interviews with graduates of the Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Disabilities Program, the team determines that all standards for the Level I program are met except Standard 13, 14, 16, 21 and 23. These standards are met with concerns as described below. All standards in the Level II Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Program are fully met.

Standards Met with Concerns
Level I Standard 13, Special Education Field Experiences with Diverse Populations - The team found that there was an attempt to embed assignments which required observations of and/or interactions with students from varied areas of service and a broad spectrum of diverse populations into several courses. However, the team also found evidence that some candidates, especially intern teachers, do not participate in the breadth of experience required by this standard. Field work experiences appear minimal, varied and inconsistent. Not all candidates have the necessary variety of age, disability population, and educator role.

Level I Standard 14, Qualifications and Responsibilities of Supervisors and Selection of Field Sites-
The team found evidence of supervisors who are qualified with appropriate experience and credentials. However, overwhelming evidence from candidates confirmed that the role of the supervisor is varied, minimal (only 2-3 visits throughout the program), and predominantly focused on completing and monitoring paperwork. The team found that candidates are not receiving complete, accurate or timely feedback, nor are the supervisors providing a model consistent with best practice.

Level I Standard 16, Effective Communication and Collaborative Partnerships - The team found that minimal attention was given to instruction in communication and collaboration in the Level I program, and that supervisors in evaluating candidate competence did not focus on finding field based evidence in this area.

Level I Standard 21, General Education Field Experiences – The team found that candidates observed general education classes, and participated in experiences in order to fulfill course assignments. There was no evidence found that these experiences, while logged and tracked, represented a "variety of field experiences," were in "different teaching arrangements," and included "prompt feedback" or "guided practice from supervisors."

Level I Standard 23, Planning and Implementing Curriculum and Instruction –
The team found that the aspect of planning instruction that includes IEP development was quite strong. However, candidates reported a lack of instruction in lesson design and implementation, specific pedagogy for students with mild/moderate disabilities, and content specific pedagogy in the Level I program.

Strengths
The program faculty is commended for their strong cohesion as a unit and their collaborative experiences.

In order to respond to the needs of a rapidly changing field, several quality programs have been initiated that allow candidates to be prepared for multiple roles in special education. Specifically, the unique multiple subject/mild-moderate dual credential program addresses a need for teachers to be qualified to work in multiple settings. The creative autism project is a greatly needed research based program which helps prepare individuals who work with this unique population.

The Level II program has been designed to allow candidate choice and self direction. Candidates report that it has met their needs as they are able to tailor the program to their own field situations. They appreciate the high quality of these very focused courses in their particular areas. They also report that Level II course work is rich and practical, allowing them to excel in their own teaching placements.

Concerns
No additional concerns.

<div align="center">

Moderate/Severe: Level I and Level II
Moderate/Severe: Internship Credential

</div>

Findings on Standards
Based on faculty and field supervisor interviews, document review, site visits, and interviews with graduates of the Education Specialist Credential: Moderate/Severe Program, the team determines that the standards are met, with the exception of Standard 13: Special Education Field Experiences with Diverse Populations and 16: Effective Communication and Collaborative Partnerships. These standards were met with concerns.

Standards Met with Concerns
Standard 13: Special Education Field Experiences with Diverse Populations.
Not all candidates assume the responsibilities of a full-time teacher, however they do assume some of the responsibilities or all of the responsibilities for some of the student case load. There is a concern that not all candidates are prepared for the rigors of full-time work in the public schools. Candidates have field work opportunities with elementary and secondary inclusion

programs. Although the program encourages candidates to experience both elementary and secondary programs, evidence indicates that not all candidates have field experiences across the age/grade ranges that are authorized by the credential. Candidates can complete credential requirements with varied experiences in inclusive settings, but no experience in Special Day Classes. This leaves the candidates unprepared for a program option used in many school districts across the state.

Standard 16: Effective Communication and Collaborative Partnerships:
Candidates are not required by the program to have experience with students aged 16-22, and many only have experience with one age level, but they do design lessons/modifications in their coursework.

Strengths
The program is to be commended for the great job they are doing preparing students to work with students needing alternative communication systems and those with behavior issues, who are included in general education classes. Graduates indicated that the faculty was very responsive when suggestions were made about alterations to make in the course content. They also felt supported and well-prepared for their current positions.

Master Teachers are enriched by their continued association with the University. The areas of augmentative and alternative communication, behavior issues, parent input and working with para-professionals, very well covered in coursework. This was verified by comments from graduates. Exceptional preparation in modifying assignments and classrooms to fully include all students is evident in the programs of graduates with this credential. Site visit to a high school program was very impressive.

Concerns
Graduates expressed a desire to have classes with regular education candidates, to obtain a different perspective in classroom discussions. There are two required regular education classes that the special education candidates are required to take, but the candidates are divided into two groups, regular and special education, and are taught in isolation.

Visual Impairment: Level I and Level II

Findings on Standards
After completion of a review of all the credential related materials provided by the university, supporting documents, and completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and master teachers, it is determined that all program standards are met for both the Level I Education Specialist in Visual Impairments and Level II Education Specialist in Visual Impairments.

Strengths
The program has a strong coordinator of the program and strong adjunct faculty. There is ongoing program consistency and stability. The program offers best practices based on the most current research in the field. There is an innovative and successful distance education program conducted for one course per semester (with rotating course subject). The distance education

program is conducted out of SFSU to simultaneously take place at Sacramento State, the Diagnostic Center in Fresno, and Cal State Monterey Bay. There is a strong emphasis on Braille literacy, with a beginning and advanced class required in Level I. There is a strong emphasis on special populations with an emphasis on students who are deaf blind. A course "Visual Impairment: Special Populations" is required in Level I. There is collaboration between the Orientation and Mobility Program as SFSU and with the Program in Visual Impairment at CSULA. There is significant collaboration with the California School for the Blind. There are 57 students in the program (28 Level II Students, 10 Minority Students, 13 Disabled Students - all but one visually impaired, 20 Distance Education Students, and 6 students who do not fall into one of the categories above). There is strong support from the SFSU Special Education Department.

Concerns
There were several comments regarding desire for more practicum, behavior management strategies, and setting up programs for students (especially students with multiple impairments) that are seen once a week or less. It is difficult for some candidates to gain experience working with students with visual impairments at all age ranges authorized by the credential (ages 0-22) and in all types of settings. Portfolios are not required for Level I and there is some concern that assessment of candidate competence may not be adequately addressed.

Physical and Health Impairments: Level I and Level II

Findings on Standards
After completion of a review of all the credential related materials provided by the university, supporting documents, and completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and master teachers, it is determined that all program standards are met for both the Level I Education Specialist in Visual Impairments and Level II Education Specialist in Physical and Health Impairments: Level I and Level II

Strengths
Students are able to take some coursework in the form of modules (every other Saturday, for 6 Saturdays, 9-5 each day). This greatly assists students who have difficulty attending courses on a weekly basis. The program has a strong emphasis on assistive technology and augmentative and alternative communication. The program is consistent and stabile. There are 43 students in the program at this time. There are usually 8 program applicants a year. There are 4 student teachers a semester and 2 master teachers each semester. Students commute an average of 2 hours one-way to attend classes at SFSU. All students are working in the field with the most difficult students in their districts. The program provides them with much needed support even after their credentials are completed. All persons interviewed are very committed to the program and to the field. There is much collaboration between the program and others in the university. There is collaboration between the PHI Program at CSULA. The program coordinator is strong and goes the extra mile to help her students while they are in the credential as well as when they have completed it. She functions as a mentor to many former students. The adjunct faculty is strong.
The emphasis on helping students with physical and health impairments achieve success in the core curriculum is evident in all coursework and in reports of PHI teachers in the field.

Concerns

There is little support from the university for distance education courses. Many persons interviewed expressed interest in such a program. There are requests from several persons that were interviewed to have more "hands on" experiences with students with physical impairments at an earlier stage of the credential program.

Deaf and Hard of Hearing Level I and Level II

Findings on Standards
The Level I Deaf and Hard of Hearing Program at San Francisco State University has undergone some professional challenges in the recent past. The only tenure track DHH credentialed, Ph.D. level professor in the program resigned. Two national searches were conducted to replace this position, neither of which had successful results. At this time, the DHH Level I and II program coordination has been taken over on a temporary basis by the Special Education Department Chair. Courses are taught by professors from other disciplines or by adjunct faculty. No new DHH graduate students are being admitted until such time as qualified, tenure track DHH faculty are in place. Because of this unusual situation, several of the Standards are designated as *Met with Concerns* and Program Standard 26: Instructional Techniques is *Not Met*. All Level II Program Standards are fully met.

Standard Not Met (Level I)
Standard 26: Instructional Techniques: The DHH Level I program does not provide sufficient evidence demonstrating the ability to plan and implement effective instruction for learners who are deaf, hard of hearing and deaf with additional special needs, in diverse learning environments.

Standards Met with Concerns (Level I)
Standard 9: Program Design: Coordination of the program and student advising needs to be provided by a qualified TT/DHH faculty member.

Standard 10: Professional, Legal and Ethical Practices: Syllabi from listed courses needs to reflect infusion of this required knowledge across the courses.

Standard 11: Educational Policy: A variety of perspectives regarding current policy needs to be included in introductory coursework.

Standard 12: Diverse Learners: Current research specific to multicultural populations of learners who are DHH needs to be included.

Standard 13: Supervisors and Selection of Field Sites: Identification and selection of DHH field sites is not implemented as the Standard requires.

Standard 17: Assessment: Reading needs to be current. Communication skills expectations need to fit the needs of students with varying language and cognitive abilities.

Standard 18: Candidate Competence: Documentation and written verification of competence needs to be provided in an organized manner.

Standard 22: Development of Professional Perspectives: Sensitivity to varied beliefs and cultural differences in the overall DHH population needs to be demonstrated. Readings need to be current.

Standard 23: Characteristics of Learners: Knowledge of current research on learning characteristics unique to students who are deaf or deaf with special needs, birth to 21, needs to be demonstrated.

Standard 24: Communication Skill Development: Baseline data and improvement in communication skills necessary to motivate and sustain interest in learners who are DHH needs to be demonstrated.

Standard 25: Student Assessment: Students in the program need to demonstrate knowledge of formal and informal (authentic, qualitative) assessment of DHH learners, birth through 21.

Standard 27: Managing Student Behavior: Readings in this area need to be current. Students in the program need to demonstrate appropriate behavior management in both academic and social settings.

Standard 28: Communication and Collaboration: The program needs to demonstrate collaboration with a variety of service providers.

Standard 29: Professionalism and Ethics: Students in the program need to demonstrate ability to work cooperatively with a variety of school community members.

Strengths
The graduate students in the program are bright, highly motivated individuals who are willing to be as flexible as possible in order to complete the credential program. There is a strong, positive collaboration with administrators and teachers at California School for the Deaf–Fremont. Many of the adjunct faculty are from CSD-F. There are exciting collaborative, innovative grant opportunities that could be pursued between SFSU and CSD-F that would benefit both the university and the school community. American Sign Language classes are popular and well-taught. There are SFSU faculty from related disciplines who are willing to teach classes and advise students in order to keep the DHH program operational until full-time, tenure track DHH faculty are hired.

Concerns
No additional concerns

Early Childhood Education Specialist Credential Level I and Level II

Findings on Standards
Based on document review, site visits, course syllabi, information booklets, field experience portfolios and interviews with graduates, candidates, employers, faculty and field supervisors of the Early Childhood Education Specialist Program, the team determines that the standards are fully met for both Level I and Level II. Written information was organized and comprehensive. Extensive time and effort has been made to align course requirements with the standards and prepare for the accreditation process.

Strengths
Faculty, graduates and candidates are dedicated and enthusiastic about the Program which prepares students for working in a variety of settings and is a leader in Early Childhood Special Education in the State, Nation and Internationally. Faculty members have written many books

and articles on various aspects of ECSE which are instrumental in creating programs and program change, and providing training for inservice teachers, in addition to training credential candidates.

The advisors ensure that the candidates complete all requirements, including Infant and Preschool Field Experiences, by meeting with each candidate every semester. The program is also tailored to meet individual goals. This sometimes means providing extra field work experiences or increased classroom support for candidates. Graduates of the program become excellent master teachers. The faculty arrange for experts in several related fields, faculty in other departments on campus, and family members to speak to the candidates. Master Teachers are enriched by their continued association with the University.

Concerns
No additional concerns

Clinical Rehabilitation Services Credential Program
Language Speech and Hearing

Findings on Standards
The Clinical Rehabilitation Services Credential program at San Francisco State University has met all the Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Clinical Rehabilitative Services (CRS) Credential programs as established by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Strengths
The addition of two new faculty members in the fall of 2006 and a possibility of a third faculty member in fall 2008 have brought new "creative energies" and new vision to the faculty. Together they are revitalizing the curriculum and forming a strategic plan for the future to address current needs (i.e. dysphagia, autism, cultural diversity), recent legislation (i.e. Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act 2004), evidence-based practices, and critical thinking and teaching.

Childhood language, Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC), and collaboration were frequently identified as strengths of the CRS program at SFSU. Collaboration between the faculties of the Special Education Physical and Health Impaired, Early Intervention, and Language, Speech, Hearing Specialists is demonstrated by class projects and course enrollment possibilities across disciplines. The three departments authored and received a significant grant for research in the use of AAC in early childhood. This emphasis has raised awareness and increased AAC use across environments for faculty and students. The Dean of San Francisco State, and Chair of the College of Education have been most supportive of the Clinical Rehabilitative Services program at San Francisco State University as demonstrated by recruiting faculty, attending the Open House, and visits to the clinic.

Graduate students and master clinicians recognize and value the faculty's "openness" and responsiveness to students and their clinical concerns. One student described the teaching in one course as being first learning, then "going and trying" what they learned, thus getting hands on experience and application. The Learning Outcome Verification Notice (LOV notes) process has been implemented since 2003 so that instructors evaluate, notify and plan needed remediation with students by the mid term of each semester. Feedback methods are in place for students and

master clinicians during informal site visits, workshops, and survey forms. The student organization, NSSHLA, reaches out to the community through Support Walk and Roll, promotes social events, brings guest speakers to the campus, and "puts on" their own CRS graduation ceremony with invited families and friends. Some students mentor undergraduates in the program. Ninety seven percent of the students completed the PRAXIS exam in 2006 up from 93% previously.

The website of CRS program has links for information about requirements, forms to be used, syllabi, and events that are continually updated and made available to students. Measures of assessment of progress are frequently used to demonstrate students' meeting requirements of ASHA knowledge and skills, prerequisites to obtain licenses from the California Board of Medical Quality Assurance, and Standards of California Commission on Teaching Credentialing.

They also note that their faculty members "walk the walk" by advocating for language speech hearing specialists and persons with disabilities in state organizations (the outgoing president of the California Speech Language Hearing Association is on the SFSU faculty), by writing peer reviewed and published articles, by identifying their own SFSU graduate, now a PhD. candidate, featured in a national magazine, and by giving the students responsibility in planning their own projects demonstrating certain skills.

Concerns
Research methods, interpretation, evaluation, and application are taught by the faculty though most students do not complete a master's thesis at this time.

Special Class Authorization (Aphasia)

Findings on Standards
The Special Class Authorization (Aphasia) meets all of the standards of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. These standards include the Core Standards, Language, Speech and Hearing Specialists' Standards 19-24, and the additional Standard 25: Assessment of Academic Abilities and Standard 26: Academic Instruction.

Bishop Graham describes the Special Class Authorization credential program to the Language Speech, Hearing Specialists candidates prior to their graduation. When a Language, Speech Hearing Specialist chooses to enroll in this program, she/he is required to (1) enroll in two additional courses, EED 682 and EED 684; (2) take and pass the Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA) examination, and (3) be employed 3 full days each week in a Special Class under a mentor with Special Class Authorization (Aphasia). After completion of the coursework and field experiences, applications are processed through the credential office.

Strengths
This program has been in place at San Francisco State University. The Clinic Director is able to recruit students and locate mentors who are qualified supervisors. This program offers persons first certificated as LSHS an additional opportunity to teach in Special Day Classes using their language and speech expertise to support learning of children with aphasia. Language Speech Hearing Specialists who add assessment and instruction in reading, writing, and math through this program provide an additional support to student learning.

Concerns
Typically this program has only one to two students though three are anticipating enrollment in the fall of 2007.

Orientation and Mobility

Findings on Standards
After completion of a review of all the credential related materials provided by the university, supporting documents, and completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and master teachers, it is determined that all program standards are met for the Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential in Orientation and Mobility.

Strengths
The program allows student to complete the credential on a part-time basis. The program has a strong emphasis on meeting the needs of individuals with additional disabilities, including deaf-blindness. Collaboration occurs with the SFSU Program in Visual Impairment regarding these special populations. The program coordinator is strong, as well as the adjunct faculty. Reports from employers of program graduates indicate high regard for their skill level. Many feel that graduates of SFSU are the best prepared of any O & M Specialists that they hire. There is collaboration with the California School for the Blind (including a program where the school repairs canes which are then sent to a unique program in Siberia – the only program for Orientation and Mobility in Europe that was established by the program coordinator of the SFSU O & M Program). The program is consistent and stabile. There are approximately 30 students in the program at this time. Most students receive national ACVREP certification.

Concerns
One employer expressed interest in having graduates have more emphasis in working with older populations, as well as with individuals with low vision (as opposed to school aged children, or individuals who are totally blind).

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential
Preliminary Administrative Services Internship Credential

Findings on Standards
After review of the institutional report, university catalog, course syllabi, candidate files, fieldwork handbook, information booklet, field experience notebook, schedule of classes, advisement documents, faculty vitae, supporting documentation and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that eleven of the fifteen program standards are met with the exception of Program Standards 1, 7, 8, and 9.

Standard Met with Concerns
Standard 8:   Guidance, Assistance and Feedback. More emphasis is needed on the relationship between standards and field experience activities.

Standards Not Met

Standard 1: Program Rationale and Design. Better communication is needed in advising students through the scope and sequence of the program. In addition, no planned process is evident for comprehensive assessment of individual candidates on all competencies.

Standard 7: Nature of Field Experiences. There is no evidence of requiring placement of candidates in a variety of school levels and settings

Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Performance. There is no evidence of at least one supervisor involved in assessment. In addition, there is no observable evidence of periodic evaluation of assessment practices.

Strengths

The Department of Educational Administration is commended in the following areas: Accessibility of faculty and staff to the needs of students; the teaching commitment of regular and adjunct faculty; faculty guidance in linking resources to current educational issues at the school sites; and, the professionalism and expertise of the department support staff. Special commendation should be given to the excellence in teaching quality and commitment to students' needs by core faculty.

Concerns

No additional concerns

Professional Administrative Services Credential

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, university catalog, course syllabi, candidate files, fieldwork handbook, information booklet, field experience notebook, schedule of classes, advisement documents, faculty vitae, supporting documentation and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that the four of the nine program standards are met: Standard 2, Standard 3, Standard 4 and Standard 5.

Standards Not Met

Standard 1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination

There is no evidence of effective coordination and communication between the institution and the candidates.

Standard 6: Provision of Mentoring Experiences

There is no evidence of provision of mentoring experiences.

Standard 7: Mentor Qualifications

No evidence of mentor qualifications was found.

Standard 8: Expectations of Candidate Performance

Expectations for candidate performance are not clearly communicated to the candidates at the beginning of the program.

Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence

There is no evidence of candidate competency rubrics to reflect attainment goals of the final portfolio and there is no evidence of a mentor's assessment of the final portfolio.

Strengths
The Department of Educational Administration must be commended in the following areas: Accessibility of faculty and staff to the needs of students; the teaching commitment of regular and adjunct faculty; faculty guidance in linking resources to current educational issues at the school sites; and, the professionalism and expertise of the department support staff. Special commendation should be given to the level of expertise demonstrated by the Tier II graduate in executing her administrative duties at Charles Drew Preparatory Academy.

Concerns
There are no additional concerns.

Pupil Personnel Services Credential
School Counseling

Findings on Standards

Based on a review of the institutional report, supporting documentation and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, community advisory members, supervising practitioners and local educational agencies, the team has determined that all program standards are met for the Pupil Personnel Services Credential authorizing practice in School Counseling.

Interviews with faculty members and students within the Department indicate a high degree of knowledge and perspective on the course content and an integration of theories and practice across courses. The team viewed the faculty as mutually supportive and dedicated to student success. The faculty shows a willingness to receive feedback and to respond to input of those in the program and the ancillary positions. Candidate competence is determined through multiple measures and at multiple points, including course assignments and exams, and supervisor and faculty ratings.

Strengths

Candidates, graduates, faculty and local school district personnel reflect enthusiasm and praise of the SFSU School Counseling Program. Multiculturalism and diversity are not only an instructional emphasis but faculty members model the value of such emphasis.

The faculty at SFSU is highly regarded by peers, graduates, employers and candidates. The candidates and graduates who were interviewed expressed appreciation for the availability, accessibility, warmth and care provided to them. It was notable how frequently the students mentioned the level of support. Candidates also expressed appreciation for the quality of professional and personal advisement provided.

Students have a rich exposure to a variety of perspectives and range of thought through common classes within the specialties of the College. Options within the Department are varied due to specializations within the College.

Fieldwork experiences are carefully designed, monitored and evaluated. There is a notable and successful effort to align fieldwork placements with the unique needs of each student. The liaison between fieldwork placement sites and the university appear strong. Faculty involvement with professional associations and engagement within their individual communities appears to add depth and breadth to student experiences. SFSU graduates, without exception, described their education as a highly positive experience and felt confident and well prepared to respond to the demands of their profession following graduation.

Concerns

None noted

School Psychology

Findings on Standards

The institutional report, with supporting documentation, was carefully and thoroughly reviewed. Candidates, graduates, employers, practicum and internship supervisors, advisory board members, and department and program faculty were interviewed. Based upon written documentation and interviews, it was determined that all program standards for the School Psychology Program, including internship, are met.

There is evidence that the program provides candidates with a strong foundation in the knowledge base for the discipline of psychology, as well as the knowledge base specific to the professional specialty of school psychology. There is evidence that candidates are well trained in a variety of assessment methods, including formal and informal test administration, behavioral assessment, interview, ecological or environmental assessment, as well as assessment methodologies. There is also evidence that Administrative and program staff have developed a high level of cooperation and articulation with programs in the College of Education and the College of Health and Human Services. Faculty have carefully developed, long-term relationships with practitioner-supervisors in the field which provide candidates with strong field experiences.

Candidate competence is determined through multiple measures and at multiple points, including course assignments and exams, and supervisor and faculty ratings.

Strengths

The program is approved by the National Association of School Psychologists. Student and graduates report that the incorporation of course offerings from the Counseling program and from College of Education into the School Psychology program increases their range of skills and their understanding of the school environment.

Students, graduates, employers, consistently commend the faculty for their commitment to high standards and to serving a diverse community. Socio-cultural competence among graduates is a long standing priority for this program and is evidenced in the infusion of this priority into the course offerings of the program and the design of the field work and internship elements of the program.

Employers report that graduates are exceptionally well-prepared for work in a variety of school settings and demonstrate well developed assessment, counseling and consultation skills, and use a data-based decision-making process. Students and field supervisor report a high level of attention and support in the development of high quality, diverse field work and internship placements by program faculty. There is evidence of strong institutional support and commitment to the school psychology program.

Concerns

None noted.

School Social Work

Findings on Standards
After careful review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, and the completion of interviews with program faculty, institutional administrators, candidates, graduates, employers, supervising field instructors, advisors, school administrators, and advisory committee members, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Pupil Personnel Service Credential: School Social Work

Strengths
Candidates, graduates, supervising field instructors, and employers have high regard for the PPS Social Work program and the strength of the underlying MSW program.

Faculty, supervising practitioners in the schools and employers deem graduates of the program to be well prepared and highly competent. They report that graduates are highly skilled, are able to establish multi-system collaboration and interventions, work effectively in a school environment, and provide culturally competent services.

Students, graduates, and employers, consistently commend the faculty for their commitment to high standards and to serving a multi-dimensional, diverse community. Socio-cultural competence among graduates is a long-standing priority for this program and is evidenced by the clear and high level of infusion of this priority into the course offerings of the program and the design of the fieldwork and internship elements of the program.

Fieldwork and Internship experiences are carefully designed, monitored and evaluated. There is a notable and successful effort to align fieldwork placements with the unique needs of each student.

Concerns
Articulation and collaboration between the PPS School Social Work program and the College of Education program appears limited.

Professional Comments

Multiple Subject and Multiple Subject BCLAD

The program has a process for placement for field experience in both Multiple Subject and Multiple Subject BCLAD Emphasis programs, but this process is very dependent on the expertise and resources of the field experience coordinator. The field experience coordinator keeps a database of candidate placement, but this database is not linked to the University database. The coordinator is also responsible for collecting field supervisor and supervising teacher assessments of student teachers, but supervisors are unaware as to where these evaluations are maintained. Supervisors also provide ongoing evaluations on student teaching progress, but only the supervisor and the students keep these evaluations and are not shared or maintained by the university.

The faculty is to be commended for its dedication and commitment to meeting the needs of the candidates in all three programs. Candidates and graduates consistently praised the faculty's availability and willingness to meet their individual needs throughout the program.

An area of potential concern in both Multiple Subject and Multiple Subject BCLAD Emphasis program (Spanish and Cantonese) is the program dependence on the excellent and very conscientious faculty and staff. Faculty cover current responsibilities; however they are stretched too thin to be able to commit to increased responsibilities. Their work overload may be a factor that impedes their engagement in the systematic analysis of assessment data currently collected, which would be valuable to guide program improvements.

While instruction in physical education and health is included in several different courses, including the Teaching Practicum and Seminar, some candidates indicated that they would like additional experiences in these areas.

Single Subject

Based on the interviews with teacher candidates and Master Teachers, it is recommended that more than two required observations be part of the Phase I and Phase II by university supervisors. Teacher candidates felt that they needed more written feedback by their university supervisors in order to support their instruction and professional development, particularly since the student teacher evaluations are utilized as part of their summative evaluation. Master teachers felt that two observations were also not sufficient particularly if a teacher candidate was experiencing difficulties in their teaching. They felt that their role needed to be more collaborative with the university supervisor by meeting more often to discuss the teacher candidate's progress in their classrooms.

There is a need for an assessment coordinator to assist the department chair to better manage and coordinate teacher candidate data in order to effectively support the department. The coordinator would assist faculty in making decisions regarding curriculum, placement, credentialing decisions and other assessment issues.

Master teachers and site administrators reported that they would like to have formal orientations regarding their role as master teachers or internship site supervisors either as a group or

individually in addition to being handed the student teaching handbook. The above procedure would "clearly-define the roles and responsibilities related to field supervision."

Teacher candidates consistently reported that having one course that specifically addresses the iCap portfolio would assist in alleviating the stress while student teaching.

Student teachers reported a concern of too much theory and therefore would like more connection with the subject specific pedagogy.

Many teacher candidates considered their computer skills beyond the level required by their technology course. Consideration should be directed towards updating course content or allowing the students a vehicle to demonstrate their skills and opt out of the course.

There is a need for more support for College of Arts and Science faculty who are involved in evaluating iCap portfolios either through release time or through a stipend and not counted as service to the university.

As the program moves to meet PACT requirements there will be a need for funding more technology (video recorders, digital cameras, scanners, etc.) equipment and software in order to support both faculty and students.

Based on the teaching and supervision loads of faculty it is evident that more resources will need to be allocated in order to support junior faculty as they move up the tenure and promotion schedule. Faculty feel de-professionalized because of a lack of institutional support and lack of funding for professional development to attend and present at conferences. Many feel devalued due to the current structure where there is a differentiation in teaching loads for credential, undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs.

Reading
Program faculty should work swiftly to implement an advanced clinical experience. Faculty might wish to consider a summer or after school reading clinic for struggling readers in grades 1-12 or a two-tiered field placement component for candidates that includes supervised observations.

In addition, faculty would do well to revise course syllabi to reflect the full range of explicit instruction and modeling in the use of strategies that develop phonemic awareness, decoding/word attack strategies, vocabulary concept development, thinking strategies, spelling, and systematic instruction in sound-symbol relationships. The needs of adolescent students might be better me through a course in adolescent literacy and/or explicit field-based assignments involving struggling adolescent readers. Candidates appear to have adequate opportunities to assess student literacy abilities.

Adapted Physical Education
This program is a gem, but is an isolated credential program operating outside of the college of education. As such, the program could benefit from stronger communication with faculty counterparts in the education programs, specifically the multiple subject, single subject, and education specialist programs.

Education Specialist Mild/Moderate

Based on interviews with candidates the team suggests that increased attention be given in coursework to developing candidates' knowledge and abilities to find, create, and use curriculum and instructional strategies specific to the mild/moderate population. Practice in learning to write lesson plans early in the program was requested along with demonstrations or specific pedagogy for the population of students with mild/moderate disabilities.

The team commends the program on providing outstanding instruction in positive behavior support and assessment both at Level I and II. These basic and advanced courses are well aligned and developmental. They provide extensive research, understanding and practice, and are appreciated by candidates in the field.

Procedures could be implemented through a more effective systematic approach to ensure that all candidates have sufficient and varied experiences in different settings. University supervisors need to have more consistent practices which reflect best practices in supervision and guidance. Candidates request more assistance, modeling, guidance and feedback in all aspects of the student teaching experience and less focus on paperwork requirements.

The dual multiple subject/mild-moderate program is in its beginning stages, and as such is being evaluated and reviewed continually by program faculty. Based on interviews with candidates in the program, the field experiences are uneven, with more field work in general education than in special education settings. Candidates would appreciate more special education experiences, more balance of the experiences, and more specifically that their experiences in the field are coordinated with the courses they take so that their assignments can be met in the setting in which they are currently placed.

Education Specialist Moderate/Severe

Graduates indicated that it would be helpful to have more information on using sign language in the classroom. Graduates indicated that they would have benefited from more training and experience with working with secondary level students.

There are no classes in Level 1 which introduce candidates to basic knowledge of a variety of disabilities, including etiologies and educational implications of each. A candidate can elect to take classes in which they can demonstrate skills in this area. Graduates indicated that this area should be strengthened to better prepare candidates.

Deaf and Hard of Hearing

In order to resolve the concerns with the SFSU DHH Credential Program, it is necessary to re-open the search for at least one full-time, tenure track, qualified faculty member in Education of the Deaf. Feedback from persons interviewed in the Special Education Department at SFSU, in the public and residential schools in the area and in the deaf community, indicate a strong desire to maintain the DHH teacher preparation program at SFSU. Such a program should be reorganized to meet the growing needs of DHH school programs in the region, as well as the state and the nation. Currently, there is no strong bilingual ASL-English teacher preparation program in the San Francisco area. Furthermore, there is not a strong, ongoing collaboration between a university and a state residential school in the area. SFSU has the unique opportunity

to work with local schools and the deaf community to set up a new and innovative bilingual/multicultural teacher preparation program with the support of the California School for the Deaf in Fremont. It is highly recommended that SFSU move forward to recruit and hire a qualified deaf faculty member to provide leadership for such a program. Absent such leadership, it may be wise to consider program closure.

Visually Impaired
This is a strong and well-respected program. The program is benefiting from the opportunities provided by the grants that the faculty has secured.

Physical and Health Impairments
This is a strong and well-respected program. Graduates also have a strong commitment to the program and help recruit candidates for it. The program is benefiting from the opportunities provided by the grants that the faculty has secured.

Early Childhood Special Education
Although the level of sign language used in Early Childhood Special Education programs is fairly basic, perhaps a graduate could come in and demonstrate/teach what will be expected when working with children and their families.

Designated Subjects: Adult Education and Vocational Education
To ensure that adjunct and non-tenure tract faculty members maintain the same high quality of instruction, the institution should consider ways to institutionalize the knowledge and skills of individual faculty members. For example:

The institution should consider explicit incorporation of pedagogy, in addition to andragogy, into the syllabi of courses whose students include both Designated Subjects Vocational Education and the Designated Subjects Adult Education Teaching Credentials;

The institution should consider explicit incorporation of the *Americans with Disabilities Act* and *IDEA* 2004 into the syllabi of courses concerning historical, legal, social, political and economic perspectives;

The institution should consider explicitly incorporating legal implications of safe facility management into the syllabi of courses concerning the development of an effective learning environment; and

Similarly, the institution might consider explicit incorporation of such topics into the observation protocol.

Adapted Physical Education
This program is a wonderful program, but is an isolated credential program operating outside of the college of education. As such, the program could benefit from stronger communication with faculty counterparts in the education programs, specifically the multiple subject, single subject, and education specialist programs.

Administrative Services
The Institution should consider establishing a more systematic method of articulation between the department and the candidates. The institution should consider establishing a requirement for placing candidates in a variety of school level settings. The institution should consider developing assessment rubrics for establishing candidate competency in the exit portfolio. The institution should consider establishing a more systematic method of providing mentoring to the candidates in the Tier II programs.

Clinical and Rehabilitative Services
Language Speech and Hearing
Faculty continue to "conduct program improvement and development based on American Speech Language Hearing Association program goals and standards" (ASHA report 2005-2006) as well as California Standards of Quality and Effective for Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential Programs. One student appreciated that faculty members are willing to say "I don't know, but I will find it for you, and Do!" The students know that their faculty "wants them to succeed." Students and faculty recognize need for "bridging" theory and practice. More than one master clinician summarized the experience with their interns from SFSU as "I gain a lot." The CRS program offers master clinicians supportive dialogue around problem solving as well as workshops where they can earn ASHA approved Continuing Education Unit credits.

A new course offering in the fall of 07 will address bilingual assessment and intervention and language development in English Language Learners. One faculty member hopes to research the "discourse" and the changes that occur in the course of group therapy, a need reflected by some master clinicians in school setting and addressed by an earlier workshop at SFSU.

Applications for the 40 acceptances are drawn from a pool of 220 applicants. The faculty is seeking to reflect the diversity of the populations they serve as they admit new students. Cultural sensitivity was reflected in the interviews with faculty and students.

Special Class Authorization (Aphasia)
All information regarding this program was collected through interview with the Clinic Director. Some faculty took exception to applying the term "aphasia" to children and thus to this special class authorization.

Orientation and Mobility
This is a strong and well-respected program. Graduates serve both children and adults with visual impairment. The program is benefiting from the opportunities provided by the grants that the faculty has secured. These grants provide considerable financial support for student tuition.